

A *Fy. 15. 31*  
# *24. 39.*

# PLEA

FOR  
*Scripture Ordination:*  
OR, TEN  
**ARGUMENTS**  
FROM  
*Scripture and Antiquity*  
PROVING  
Ordination by Presbyters without  
Bishops to be valid.



---

By J. O. Minister of the Gospel.

---

To which is prefixt an Epistle by the  
Reverend Mr. Daniel Williams.

*Episcopi noverint se magis consuetudine quam  
dispositione Dominicæ veritate, Presbyterus  
esse maiores.* Hieron. in Ep. ad. Tit.

I Cor. 4. 1. "Οὐαὶ γάρ τοι λογίσαντο ἀθηναῖς, οἵτινες  
ὤπερας Χερσοῦ, καὶ αἰχνήματος αὐτοῖς Θεοῖς.

---

London: Printed for J. Dabinett at the Rising Sun  
in Cornhill over-against the Royal Exchange. 1694.

# A P L E A

FOE

Quæcunq; Quidam

OR TEN

ALLEGORIA



Academie Cantabrigiensis  
Liber

808107

---

---

# THE PREFACE.

**T**HE Cause which these Papers Vindicate is not that of a Party, as some unthinking People may imagine, but of the Reformation in General, which has been propagated and supported, in its most flourishing Branches, by the Ministry here pleaded for. The Ancient *Vaudens*, or *Waldenses*, those eminent and faithful Witnesses against Antichristian Usurpations, have had no other for near 500 years past \*. The first guides of the People from *Mystical Egypt*, were Presbyters Ordained by <sup>\* Petrus Hist. p. 53,</sup> *Mystical 62.* <sup>Hist. of the Vaudens, c. 3</sup>

## The Preface.

Presbyters. These are they that gathered the first Fruits unto God ; under the Conduct of these the persecuted *W O M A N F L E D* through a Sea of Blood *into the Wilderness* : by their Ministry she hath been fed and nourished, these make the first Figure among the *Witnesses that prophecy in Sackcloth* ; they have gone in mourning from one Generation to another. When others have assumed *Beauty for Asbes*, the *Oyl of Joy for mourning*, the *Garment of Praise for the Spirit of heaviness* ; these have been fed with the *Bread of Tears*, have been filled with bitterness, and made drunk with *Wormwood*. They have been *Men of Sorrows*, and acquainted with grief. They have been sore broken in the place of Dragons, and covered with the Shadow of Death ; yet have they not forgotten the Name of their God , or stretched out their hand to a strange God. It's by the Ministry of these that the Truth prevailed , the Eyes of Nations were opened , and vast Multitudes reduced to the Obedience of the Gospel. They seal'd their Ministry with

## The Preface.

with their Blood, and Heaven sealed it with the most glorious success.

\* *Rainerius*, one of their Formen-<sup>\* Contra</sup> tors, complains of them, that they had <sup>Waldens.</sup> spread through all Countries, and crept <sup>cap. 4.</sup> into every Corner.

*Walsingham*, our Country-man, tells us how the *Lolards* (as they were here called) had fill'd our Land, and had their Ministers *Ordain'd by Pres-* <sup>Walsing.</sup> *byters without Bishops*: that they justified these Ordinations, and asserted an inherent Power in Presbyters to put forth all Ecclesiastical A&ts without distinction.

We may rationally presume that their practise was uniform in other Countries; and had we exact Records of their Church Administrations, we should find innumerable Instances of Ordination by Presbyters among them: but the account they give of themselves is so very imperfect, that had not their Enemies transmitted to Posterity a Narrative of their Actions and Sufferings (though very partially) we should have known little of them.

## The Preface.

We have no reason to think that those blessed Worthies did either alter their Judgments, or supersede their Practice concerning Ordination by Presbyters; and therefore I take it for granted, that the same Ministry continued among them until the begining of the Reformation.

Here in *England* several of the Bishops were eminently instrumental in promoting the Reformation, which gave them a deserved esteem in the thoughts of all good men, especially of the poor *Lolards*, to whom that great *Change* was a Resurrection from the dead.

By this means the Bishops continued their stations in the Church, and were entrusted with the principal management of Ordination, which their Popish Predecessors had ingrossed into their hands long before.

But though Matters were thus settled, they were far from Claiming to themselves a superior Power over Presbyters, or stamping a *Jus Divinum* upon their Office. They acknowledged the identity of Bishops and Presbyters, that Ordination by Pres-

## The Prefacē.

Presbyters was valid, and that Episcopacy was a bare *Constitution of the Civil Magistrate*<sup>\*</sup>, for the better governing of the Church. All this will be fully proved in the following Discourse.

Thus it was in *England*, but in the foreign Churches it was quite otherwise; there the Bishops were implacable Enemies to the Reformation, which gave the Presbyters an Opportunity of re-assuming their inherent Power of Ordination, and of laying aside the pretended superior Order of Bishops, as those who had appropriated to themselves the just Rights of Presbyters, and divested them of the inseparable Privileges of their Order: and had been so far from answering the first design of their Constitution, of being a *Remedy against Schism*<sup>†</sup>, that partly by their Arbitr<sup>+</sup>ary Impositions, and partly by their boundless Ambition, they had miserably torn and divided the Christian Church for several Ages before, and contributed to the establishment of the usurping Bishop of *Rome*. For these and other Reasons, they rejected Bishops.

## The Preface

stopps from having any part in their  
Church Government. This they com-  
mitted to the Presbyters, by their inde-  
pendent Right. A. dicitur ergo quod si  
Concilio q. Presbyterorum D. gallo  
rum gubernabatur Ecclesia. Hieron. ubi supra, & ad Evangelium  
et. in iud. huiusmodi si aew. si aew.

I If a Popish Bishop happened to be  
Converted to the Protestant Religion,  
he was not capable of Exercising his  
Ministry among them, no not as a  
Presbyterian till he submitted to a new  
Ordination. ¶

This Establishment enraged their  
Roman Prelates, and drew forth their  
strongest Efforts to assert their tottering  
Hierarchy, and to overthrow the Reformed  
Ordinations. against ergo lo modi

Therefore the principal and leading  
Antagonists we have to do with, in the  
present Controversie, are the Papists,  
especially the Jesuits, who with one  
Mouth condemn Ordinations by Pres-  
byters. but yes . . . non, iust. et. auctor

With us it's a very small thing that  
we should be judg'd of Man's day, we  
acquiesce in that Judgment which will  
dispense Rewards and Punishments, not  
according to the disputable Modes of  
Mens

¶ See La  
Rocque's  
Conform.  
of Disci-  
pline, cap.  
1. art. 3.

## *The Preface.*

Mens entrance into the Office, but as they have faithfully, or otherwise, discharged the Duties of the *Sacred Ministry*.

Happy they, whose Record is on high, whose Witness is in Heaven, whose Testimony is in their own Bosoms, and in the Conscience of those that hear them.

I leave the following Discourse to recommend it self unto thee ; Read with observation, weigh every thing in an even Ballance, and let the Impressions of Truth form an Impartial Judgment.

*J. O.*

---

**TO**

## To the Reader

whereas entrance into the Office, but as  
sheweth private multiplicity, or otherwise, diffi-  
cult to the Deceit of the Sathanic Wi-

Habba tipe, whose Record is cou pligr  
mptose. Whiche is in Heaven, where the  
fismonach is in spirit our Pocouat, and in  
the Courtioes of God, soe that these

TO THE

I have the following Discourse to  
communicate to you, whoe have  
of late time given a turne to your  
concerning the Truth, and the  
Truth concerning the Truth, and the  
Truth concerning the Truth.

READER.

**T**HE indispensable use of a Gospel Ministry must appear to such as at all consider, the ignorance of Mankind in the way of Eternal Life, the innate aversion to the terms of Reconciliation with God, the Mystery of Gospel Revelations, the subtle and unwearied Attempts of Seducers against the Truth, the backwardness to improvement in Grace and a Life according to the Rules of Christianity, which even they discern, who are

## To the Reader.

are not utter Strangers to the Impressions of a Divine Power, by the Word, in the illumination of their Minds, and renovation of their Wills. Tea further, who would sustain the Labour and Hazards of this holy Calling, or attend thereto with an assiduity requisite to the ends thereof, if not by Office obliged? Nay, how would it enervate our Pleadings with Sinners, and abate that Assurance given to Believers by the Word and Sacraments, if we did not transact between God and them, as cloathed with the Authority of Ambassadors, delegated by Christ thereto, and supported by his Presence and Power in our Administrations?

The Lord Jesus, as Head of the Church, promiseth and dispenseth Gifts suitable to the Ministerial Office, and renders them so essential thereto, as that none can be duly admitted to this Trust, who are not in some good degree fit to teach, divide the Word aright, convince Gain-sayers; yea credibly appearing devoted to God, and concerned for the Salvation of Men. No Ordinaries can dispense

## To the Reader.

dense with the want of these; nor is the Ministerial Office conveighed by the greatest Solemnities to any Man void of these Qualifications; though the best accomplished may awfully say, οὐδὲ τίνει τίς γρός, 2 Cor. 2.16.

The same holy Instituter of this Office hath wisely provided against Intruders; and also for the encouragement of such as are capable, by subjecting Probationers ordinarily to the Enquiry and Judgment of Men fit, and authorized to determine of their Call and Endowments, and to invest them in the Office of a Presbyter, by Fasting and Prayer, with imposition of Hands: the Authority and Obligations of which Office are in the Scriptures adjusted by Christ, and can admit of no Change at the Will of the Ordainers.

Reason directs that the Ordainers should be fit to judge of the necessary Qualifications of such as are proposed to this Charge: The Scriptures determine that the Ordainers be such as are invested and exercised in the same holy Office. And who

## To the Reader.

who so capable to judge, or likely to be careful and faithful in their Admissions? These are appointed to make a Minister, though Churches are to elect who so approved shall be their Minister: Pastors invest in the Office, though the People do appropriate the more stated and usual Employment of the Officer. Confusion and a degenerate Ministry must ensue Mens attempting the Ministry, if they get but a good conceit of themselves, or that particular Churches assume the sending forth Preachers, or making Ministers for themselves, unless in Cases very extraordinary.

The Reverend Author in the following Treatise hath no design to reflect on Episcopal Ordination, nor to raise any unseasonable Debates among Protestants. But being in a peculiar manner assaulted as an Usurper of the Ministerial Office, because separated thereto by the imposition of no Hands besides those of Presbyters. He herein affirms, and I think with great Judgment and Evidence proveth, That Presbyters, though no Prelates, are authorized

## To the Reader.

authorized by the Lord Jesus to Ordain fit Persons to the Office of Presbyters, and that the Ordination of such is valid. Many have successfully engaged in this Debate heretofore, yet thou wilt find some very considerable Addition to what occurs in most other Authors. It's not unworthy the Animadversion of all concerned for the meer being of Religion, that there is a general Attempt this day, not only against the Exercise of the Ministry in an aptitude to its end, but against the very Office of the Ministry: many that widely differ in other things, do yet center herein. The forwardness of some to nullifie the Mission of their Brethren, conduces as much thereto as any thing, except the Personal Faults of Ministers. Such decisions of the Subject in debate, yield no small Advantage to the Romish Hierarchy, whiles most Protestants are unchurched, and their Holy Administrations arraigned as Nullities. A Notion that never obtained in the English Church till the Gracian design received Patronage here, and that

## To the Reader.

that to subserve purposes as little propitious to our Civil Rights, as to Religion it self. The Increase of Purity, Self-denial, Light and Love, would soon decide Cases more important; and render the Vitals of Christianity more secure, which are now so variously exposed.

Octob. 14.

1693.

I am thy Servant

in our common Lord,

*Daniel Williams.*

---

## ERRATA.

Page 64. l. 4. r. Writers. ibid. l. 18. r. occasionally.  
p. 91. l. 2. r. *tegladantay.* p. 100. l. 9. r. too.

Through a Mistake of the Printer Chap. VI. is made Chap. V. and Chap. VII. is made Chap. VI. and so unto the end of the Book. So Arg. V. is made Arg. IV. and Arg. VI. is made Arg. V. and so forward unto the last.

A

## To the Reader

that to neglect the purpose of these  
Editions is the chief Negligence, in  
Religion it is the chief Negligence of the  
Society, for instance, That any Person  
would soon perceive that most simple  
Truths; and such as are the Pillars of Chris-  
tianity more Remote, before he com-  
mences his reading.

Ogden, 4.

163.

I am by a Gentle-

In the following Period

## Daniel Mullaney

## ERRATA

Pages 7, 8, &c. in Volume. Chap. 18. in consequence  
of which, the subscribers paid 100. £. instead

of 50. £. 5. s. consequence of this mistake Chap. VI. is made  
Chap. V. and Chap. VI. if made Chap. VI. it may be  
the reason of the Book. so Vol. A. is made Vol. VI.  
and Vol. VI. is made Vol. V. and so following into the first

A

A  
**P L E A**  
 FOR  
*Scripture Ordination, &c.*

---

**C H A P. I.**

*The Use and Efficacy of the Ministry.  
 It's opposed by open Violence,  
 false Teachers, Divisions; the  
 last of which occasioned the pre-  
 sent Undertaking. The Case of  
 Ordination by Presbyters stated.*

**T**H E Ministry of Reconciliation  
 is that powerful Engine by  
 which the strong Holds of Sa-  
 tan are demolished, the Gates of Hell  
 B              broken

## A PLEA for

broken down, Sin's Captives reduced, and Trophies erected in honour of the victorious Prince of Peace. The Dispensation of the Gospel is the Glory of Nations, the Support of Christianity, the Shield of Truth, and the Triumph of the Cross. By this despised means Christ *divides him a portion with the great, and shares the spoil with the strong;* by the foolishness of Preaching he confounds the Wise, and by weak earthen Vessels he breaks the Iron-Scepter of the Prince of the Power of the Air.

For this reason it is that Gospel Ministers are so much opposed in the world, while the Prince of Darkness hath a Kingdom in it, he'll bend all his Forces against them, as Invaders of his Dominions, and irreconcilable Enemies to his usurped Regiment.

Many and various are his Serpentine Devices and repeated Stratagems to render their Endeavours of winning Souls ineffectual. Sometimes he assaults them by open Violence, he pours upon them the strength of Battel, to the disgracing of their Persons, the spoiling of their Goods, the infringing of their Liberties, and the sacrificing of their very Lives

Lives to the insatiable Rage of unreasonable Men. They are killed all the day long, and accounted as sheep for the slaughter, and yet in all these things are more then Conquerors through him that loved them, and hath promised his Presence with them to the end of Time; He holds the Stars in his right Hand, guides their Motions, and restores a declining World by their powerful Influences.

Their restless Adversary failing in his former method transforms himself into an Angel of Light, that he may more insensibly destroy the Angels of the Churches. What he cannot effect by Power, he will attempt by Craft. He'll send forth his daring Emissaries to undermine Preaching by Preaching. Thus the Adversaries of *Zedab* offered to build the Temple, that they might hinder the building of it. St. Paul's Enemies preached Christ of envy and strife, that they might obstruct his sincere Preaching. The Devil himself turns Preacher in the *Pythonic* Woman to scandalize the Apostle's Ministry. He emits Wolves in Sheepscloathing to tear and devour the unwary Flock.

## A PLEA for

If he be defeated in this Attempt, he'll make trial of skill in as pernicious a way as either of the former, to wit, by alienating their Affections, and imbibiting their Spirits towards one another. He arms them with Weapons that are foreign to the nature of their warfare, he turns their Plow-shares into Swords, and makes Ambassadors of Peace to become Heralds of War, and the Fathers of Unity Sons of Discord. Of all Divisions those amongst Ministers have the saddest tendency; of all the Divisions of Ministers, those that concern their Ministerial Call are the most destructive.

Eph.4. 11.  
14. of Unity Sons of Discord. It is not strange that Romish Priests should condemn all Reformed Ministers without distinction, that the spurious Offspring of the Scarlet Whore should conspire against the Seed of the Woman, that the Ministers of Antichrist should reject the Ministers of Christ. Their unmerited Condemnation is our Convincing Justification.

But that which administers just cause of Sorrow, is to behold Protestant Ministers uncharitably Arraigning one another. Some unthinking Dissenters ignorantly condemn all that are Ordained

ed

5

## Scripture Ordination, &c.

ed by Bish<sup>ps</sup> as no Ministers of Christ, not considering that thereby they nullifie their own Baptism, which most of them received from Episcop<sup>al</sup> Ministers; if they are but meer Lay-men, their Baptism is no Baptism, and ought to be repeated in the Judgment of many. This Principle naturally leads to Anabaptism.

On the other hand, some Dignitaries of the Church of England condemn all that are not Ordained by Bish<sup>ps</sup> as no Ministers, and so they Anathematize all the Reformed Churches that have no Bish<sup>ps</sup>; they affirm their Ministry and Sacraments to be meer Nullities, and that there is no Salvation to be had in their Communion; and therefore that it is safer to continue in the Roman Church: as if the empty Name of a Bishop were more necessary to Salvation, than an interest in the great Bishop of our Souls, the Lord Jesus; and an Idolatrous Heretical Church under the Conduct of Antichristian Bish<sup>ps</sup>, were preferable to an Evangelical Orthodox Church without them. But these severe Judges that pass a damnatory Sentence upon the greatest, if not the best

part of the Reformed Churches are worthily deserted by all sober and moderate Church-men.

Others of that Communion own Ordination by Presbyters without Bishops to be valid, but they look upon them as Schismatical, where Bishops may be had. We have no Controversie with these about the validity of Ordination by Presbyters, but about the Charge of Schism, which we conceive falls upon the Imposers of unscriptural Conditions of Ordination.

Others allow Ordinations by Presbyters in the Foreign Churches, who have no Bishops; but they Censure such Ordinations for Nullities, where Bishops may be had, as in *England*. Our present Controversie is with these. For the stating of the Point in difference, we'll consider, 1. Wherein we are agreed; 2. Wherein the real difference lies.

### Our Agreement.

We agree,

1. That Christ hath appointed a Ministry in his Church. A Gospel Ministry is not of Humane, but of Divine

Original.

## *Scripture Ordination, &c.*

7

Original. It belongs to Jesus Christ to institute what sort of Officers must serve in his House.

2. We agree that the Ministry is a standing Office to continue in the Christian Church to the end of Time, *Math.28.19,20.*
3. That no Man ought to take upon him the Sacred Office of a Minister of the Word, without a lawful Calling or Mission, *Rom.10.14,15. Jer.14.14 Heb.5.4.*
4. That Ordination is always to be continuall in the Church, *Tit.1.5. 1 Tim.5.21,22.*
5. That Ordination is the Solemn setting apart of a Person to some Publick Church-Office.
6. That every Minister of the Word is to be Ordained by Imposition of Hands, and Prayer with Fasting, *Act.8.13. 1 Tim.5.22.*
7. That he who is to be Ordained Minister must be duly qualified both for Life and Ministerial Abilities, according to the Rules of the Apostle, *1 Tim.3. Tit.1.6,7,8,9.*

In these things which comprehend all the Essentials of the Ministry, what-

B 4 ever

ever more, we are fully agreed.

The main difference is about the Persons Ordaining. We say, Ordination may be perform'd by meer Presbyters. Some of our Brethren of the Episcopal Persuasion say, That no Ordinations are valid but such as are done by Diocesan Bishops. The common Cry against Protestant dissenting Ministers is, That they are no true Ministers of Christ, but Intruders and false Prophets. And why so? Not because they are not Orthodox in their Doctrine, for they have subscribed all the Doctrinal Articles of the Church of *England*: Nor can they charge them with Insufficiency or Scandal, nor they are generally Persons of approved Abilities, exemplary Conversations, and great Industry in the Lord's Vineyard, who seek not their own things, but the things of Christ. They are willing to be tried by the Characters of Gospel Ministers. Where lies the defect then? why in this, they are not Ordained by *Bishops*. They derive not their Power from such Dicessans as pretend to an uninterrupted Succession down from the Apostles. They were Ordained by meer Presbyters that have

have not the Ordaining Power, and none can communicate that to another which he hath not in himself.

Our Case then in short is this, Whether Ordination by meer Presbyters, without Diocesan Bishaps, be valid. The Question needs but little Explanation.

By *Ordination*, I mean the setting of Persons apart by Imposition of Hands for the Sacred Office of the Ministry.

By *Presbyters*, I understand Gospel Ministers, who are called to the Over-fight of Souls, and to whom the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven are committed.

By *Diocesan Bishops* I intend that Species of Church Officers which claim to themselves a Superior Power of Order and Jurisdiction above Presbyters, and to be the sole Pastors of several hundreds of Congregations, having Parish Priests under them who have no Power of Discipline in the Church.

By *valid*, I mean not what the Old Canons make so, but what the Scriptures determine to be so. Those Sacred ~~Oracles~~ which are of Divine Inspiration, and not Arbitrary Canons of weak Men's devising, are the Foundation of our Faith, and the infallible Standard by which

which Truth and Error must be tried.

The Question being thus explained, I affirm,

*That such as are set apart with Imposition of Hands for the Office of the Ministry by Gospel Ministers, without the Species of Church Officers who claim a superior Power over Presbyters, are regularly Ordained, and their Ordination is valid according to the Scriptures.*

This Truth I hope to demonstrate by the following Arguments.

**CHAP.**

## C H A P. II.

Presbyters have power to Ordain, because they are Scripture Bish-  
ops. The Syriac Translation useth not different Names. If there be a difference, the pre-  
minence belongs to the Presbyter. Objection concerning Timothy and Titus answered. 1. The Je-  
suits urge this against the Prote-  
stants. 2. The Scripture doth not call them Bishops. 3. The Govern-  
ment of Ephesus was in the Pres-  
byters of that Church. 4. St.  
Paul doth not mention Timothy in his Epistle to the Ephesians,  
as he doth in other Epistles.  
5. When St. Paul took his last  
leave of them, he made no men-  
tion of Timothy for his Success-  
or, though he were present.  
6. He

6. He did not reside at Ephesus.  
 7. Ephesus no Diocesan Church,  
 but a Parochial or Congregational.  
 The Asian Angels no Diocesan Bishops : Prov'd from the  
 extent of the Asian Churches,  
 from Tyconius in Austin. Con-  
 tents of our authoriz'd Bibles,  
 and acceptation of Angel in the  
 Jewish Church.

**Arg. I.** **T**HAT Ordination which hath all the Scripture requisits is valid, but Ordination by Presbyters hath all the Scripture requisits, Therefore — The Major is undeniable to Persons that own the inspired Writings to be a perfect Rule. The Minor I thus prove : The Scripture requisits of Ordination, are some in the Ordainers, some in the Ordained, some in the Circumstances of Ordination, As to the Ordained, they must have such Qualifications as the Scripture requires : *Tim. 3. . .* These we are willing to be tried by As to the Circumstances there must be Examination, Approbation, publick and solemn setting apart

part by imposition of Hands, with Fast-  
ing and Prayer. As to the Ordainers,  
tis enough that they were Presbyters,  
and as such had an inherent Power to  
Ordain; for according to Scripture, a  
Bishop and a Presbyter are one and the  
same, not only in Name, but in Office.  
The Elders or Presbyters of *Ephesus* are  
call'd Bishops of *Ephesus*, to whom the  
sole over-sight of that Church did be-  
long, *Acts 20. 17, 28.* The Presbyters  
of the Jewish *Diaspora*, to whom St. Pe-  
ter wrote, are requir'd *ποιμανεῖς, ἀπο-*  
*πολεῖς,* to feed or rule the Flock, and to  
perform the office and work of Bishops  
among them \*: *ποιμανεῖς* signifies to  
rule †. They are called Rulers and Go-  
vernours || . . . *Justin Martyr* calls the  
chief Minister of the Church *προΐστας τῷ*  
*ἀδηλόποιῳ.* St. Paul's ruling Presbyter is  
*Justin's* ruling Bishop. Bishops and Pres-  
byters have one and the same Qualifica-  
tions, *Tit. 1. 5, 7.* After he had given the  
Character of Persons to be Ordain'd  
Presbyters, v. 5, 6. he adds a reason, v. 7.  
*διὸ γὰρ ἐπικονιωπός ἐστιν πάντων εἰς,* &c. There  
would be no force in the Apostles rea-  
soning, if Bishops were of a superior  
Order to Presbyters.

The

<sup>\*</sup> 1 Pet. 5.<sup>1, 2.</sup><sup>† Rev. 2. 27</sup><sup>1 Tim.</sup><sup>5. 17-</sup>  
*προΐστας τῷ*  
*ἀδηλόποιῳ*

## A PLEA for

The Scriptures own but two Orders  
of ordinary Church Officers, Bishops and  
Deacons<sup>1</sup>, and of these Bishops there  
were more then one in every Church:  
So there was at *Philippi* and at *Ephes-*  
<sup>2</sup> *Acts 20. fuit* <sup>3</sup>. To be sure then, they were  
*17, 28.* not Bishops of the English Species, i.e.  
Tote Governors of many Churches, but  
Presbyters in a proper sense; many of  
which were Ordain'd in every Church,  
<sup>4</sup> *Acts 14. Antioch* it self not excepted <sup>5</sup>. The A-  
*21, 22, 23.* postles gave that Church no Primacy a-  
bove *Lystra* and *Iconium*, but settled the  
same sort of Officers in all. Though af-  
terward it overtopt it's Neighbours, and  
became a Metropolitical Church. But  
from the beginning 'twas not so.

The Syriac Translation, which is so  
very ancient, that it comes nearest in  
time to the Original, useth not two words,  
one for Bishop, another for Presbyter,  
as our Translation and the Greek, but  
it hath only *W'wp* the word in Chaldee  
and in Syriac signifies Presbyters. *Tit.*  
*1. 5. & Constitueres . Iacob Seniores*  
*in qualibet Civitate, v. 7. debet enim*  
*Iacob Senior esse irreprobenbilis. I*  
*have left thee in Creet to ordain Elders*  
*in every City, for an Elder [we say Bi-*  
*shop]*

shop] must be blameless . . . So in 1 Tim. 3.1. *The Office of a Bishop*, as we render it out of the Greek : The Syriac reads it ~~the Office of a Bishop~~ *the Office of a Presbyter*. Instead of *Bishops* and *Deacons* in Pbil. 1.1. the Syriac reads it *Presbyters* and *Deacons*. This is a strong proof that the distinction of Bishop and Presbyter was unknown when that Translation was made, for it useth not so much as different Names. Of the Antiquity of the Syriac Version *vide Walt.*

If there be any distinction between a Bishop and a Presbyter, the pre-<sup>\*Walt.</sup>  
miance must be given by the Scripture 30—40.  
to the Presbyters ; for as our Bishops  
say, their Office distinct from Presby-  
ters, is to Rule and Govern, and the  
Office of a Presbyter is to Preach and  
Administer the Sacraments. Now the  
Administration of the Sacraments and  
Preaching, are more excellent Works  
than Ruling and Governing. The A-  
postle saith expressly, *that they that la-  
bour in the Word and Doctrine, deserve  
more honour than they that rule well*. || 1 Tim.  
5. 17.

Moreover, the Apostles stile them-  
selves *Presbyters*, but never *Bishops*. St.  
Peter calls himself *Presbyter* †, but never <sup>† 1 Pet.</sup>  
calls <sup>5. 1.</sup>

calls himself a Bishop. And therefore it's a wonder the Pope, his pretended Successor, and those that derive their Canonical Succession from his Holiness, should call themselves *Bishops*, unless it be by the Divine Disposal to shew the fallibility of their Foundations.

**Object.** The Papists, who therein are imitated by some of our Adversaries, do say, That the Names are common, but the Offices are distinct. Thus *Spensæus*\*, contra *Bn-*  
\* Spens.  
contra Bn-  
ct.  
ct.  
a Sorbonist, objects, *Nominum quidem esse,*  
*sed non munericum confusione.*

**Answ.** The Instances mentioned above do clearly Evince an Identity of Offices. When the Apostle bids the Presbyters of *Ephesus take heed to all the Flock over which the Holy Ghost had made them Bish-*  
† *Acts 20.*  
28. *bops* †; he doth not speak of the Name  
|| 1 Pet. 5. St. Peter || speaks of the Office, when  
1. 2.  
2. 2. he Exhorts the Presbyters to feed the  
2. 2. Flock, and to perform the Office of Bishops  
2. 2. among them; so that there were as many Bishops as there were Presbyters in  
2. 2. Churches of the Apostles planting.

How comes it to pass when the Apo-  
\* Eph. 4. stle reckons up the several \* sorts of Mi-  
11. nisters, which Christ had appointed in  
his

his Church that he makes no mention of *Superior Bishops*, if they be so necessary as some would have us believe. He mentions *Pastors* and *Teachers*. The Patrons of Episcopacy will not say *Bishops* are meant by *Teachers*, their proper work being Ruling: nor can they be meant by *Pastors*, for *Presbyters* are *Pastors*, and exhorted to *feed the Flock*\*. Our Learned Writers against Popery<sup>17, 28.</sup> think it a good Argument to disprove the Pope's Headship, that he is not mention'd in the List of Church Officers + reckoned up in the *New Testament*: no more is a Bishop superior to *Presbyters*, so much as nam'd in those places. If any say tis omitted, because he was to succeed the Apostles, he hath the Pope ready to joyn with him in the same Plea for his Office.

*Object.* *Timothy* and *Titus* were Scripture Bishops, superior to *Presbyters*.

*Answe. I.* The Papists urge this Ob-  
jection against the Protestants. So  
doth *Turrianus* the Jesuit; so doth  
*Bellarmino*. Our English Episcopacy  
hath scarce one Argument for it's De-  
fence, but what will indifferently serve,  
the Popish Prebacy. The Bishops best  
Wea-

<sup>|| Vid. Terri  
Sophis in  
ter Sacerd.  
Op. p. 598.</sup>

# A PLEA for

Weapons have been Consecrated in the Jesuits School, and have been dexterously manag'd against the whole Reformation.

II.

II. But, I pray, where doth the Scripture give *Timothy* and *Titus* the Title of Bishops? The Postscripts to the Epistles directed to them, are confessedly no part of Scripture, nor are they very ancient. The Postscripts to the Syriac makes no mention of their being Bishops; nor can it be gathered from the Body of the Epistles, that they were Bishops. When the second Epistle to *Timothy* was written, he was an Evangelist, and therefore no Bishop. He is exhorted to do the work of an Evangelist, 2 Tim. 4. 5. Suppose *Paul* had said, *Do the work of a Bishop*: would not our Episcopal Men have judg'd it a clear Argument for his Episcopal Power? Who could do the Work of a Bishop, but a Bishop? In like manner we say, None can do the work of an Evangelist, but an Evangelist? Evangelists were extraordinary Officers, above Pastors and Teachers\*. The work of an Evangelist is set forth at large by *Eusebius*: They did preach Christ to those which had not as yet heard the Word

<sup>¶</sup>Euseb.  
Hist. III.  
34.

of

of Faith, they delivered unto them the Holy Scriptures, ordain'd Pastors, committed to them the Charge of those that were newly received into the Church, and they did *τις οὐδὲν μεταβαίνειν*, pass over unto other Countries and Nations. With whom agrees \*Chryfostom, \*In Eph 4. *Τέτταρες εὐαγγελισταὶ οἱ μὲν πρεσβυτῆρες παραχθήσονται, ἀλλ' εὐαγγελιζόμενοι, καὶ αριστοκληταὶ, καὶ Ἀκιλλαῖ.*

A Learned Prelate of the Church of England conceives the Bishops to succeed the Apostles, the Presbyters to succeed the Prophets, and the Deacons to succeed the Evangelists; and if so, the Deacons may put in a Claim to the Ordaining Power; for Timothy an Evangelist assumed it, whose Successors they are. If Evangelists were not proper Successors to the Apostles, and Bishops be not Successors to the Evangelists, I cannot see how Timothy's doing the work of an Evangelist can support the *Jus Divinum* of English Episcopacy.

Nor can any thing be concluded from the Apostle's words to him, *Lay hands on no man suddenly* †: Doth it follow therefore the sole Power of Ordination in *Ephesus* did belong to him? It may

<sup>†</sup> 1 Tim.  
5. 22.

## A PLEA for

as rationally be infer'd the sole power of Exhorting and Teaching did belong to him ; for the Apostle bids him *be instant in season and out of season in preaching the Word* ||.

<sup>1. 2.</sup> If it be laid, Preaching is common to Presbyters , but so is not Ordination, it's *gratis dictum*, and a beginning of the Question. *Paul* did not invest *Timothy* with a greater power than he himself did Exercise. He did not assume the power of Ordination into his own hands, but takes the Presbytery with him \*. He joyned *Barnabas* with him, if not others, in the Ordination

<sup>\* 1 Tim. 4. 14</sup> <sup>† Acts 14.</sup> of Presbyters at *Antioch* †. *Timothy's*

<sup>23.</sup> abiding in *Ephesus* doth not prove him to be Bishop there ; for *Paul* did not joyn him to be resident there, but be-

<sup>1. 1 Tim. 3. & 4. 13.</sup> sought him to abide there till he came ||, which he intended shortly to do \*. The

<sup>14.</sup> <sup>\* 1 Tim. 3. 14. 15.</sup> Apostle sent him to *Corinth*, *Philippi*, *Theffalonica*, furnished, without doubt, with the same powers which he had at *Ephesus*, otherwise his Negotiations had not been effectual to settle those Churches ; and was he Bishop of these places also ?

*Bellarmino* grounds *Timothy's* Episcopal Jurisdiction upon <sup>1 Tim. 5. 19.</sup> *A*gainst

gainst an Elder receive not an Accusation, &c. which Dr. Whittaker, Divinity Professor in Cambridge, undermines and overthrows by demonstrating that this place proves not *Timothy's* power over Presbyters: his words are these, *Ex Apostoli mente* — According to the meaning of the Apostle to receive an Accusation, is to acquaint the Church with the Crime †. Which not only Superiors, <sup>Whitt.</sup> but Equals, yea and Inferiors also may <sup>contr. 5. q. 1.c. 2. f. 16.</sup> do.

The Presbyters and the People may receive an Accusation against their Bishop; are they therefore Superior to him? || Cyprian writes to *Epidetus*, and || *Cyp. Ep. 64—68.* the People of *Affura*, not to admit *Fortunatianus* to be Bishop again, because he had denied the Faith. He commends also the Clergy and People of *Spain* for rejecting *Basilides* and *Martialis* who had sacrificed to Idols.

III. When *Timothy* was made Bishop of *Ephesus*, where we find several Presbyter-Bishops before ||: what became of them? were they unbishop'd and made simple Presbyters, that they must no more Ordain or Govern, but be subject to *Timothy*? Twas thought no small

III.

|| Acts 20.  
17, 28.

punishment in after Ages for a Bishop to be degraded into the Presbyter's form, and 'twas for some notorious Crime. What Crime were these guilty of?

## IV.

If *Timothy* was the fixed Bishop of *Ephesus*, whom St. *Paul* had deputed for his Successor, and so not subject to him any more, how comes he to promise to come shortly to *Ephesus* himself\*. What had *Paul* to do in *Ephesus* now, if he had settled a Successor there, and had no power over him or his Church? He forbids others to be ~~magi-~~  
~~egy~~<sup>1</sup>, busie bodies in other mens mat-  
<sup>2</sup>ters †; and would he himself be such a  
<sup>3</sup>one? *Ἄπολεμονοι* are condem-  
<sup>4</sup>ned ‡, and shall we make *Paul* of this  
<sup>5</sup>number? ¶

It's more unaccountable that St. *Paul* should write an Epistle to the *Ephesians* (long after the first Epistle to *Timothy*) and not mention their pretended Bishop *Timothy* in the whole Epistle, as he doth in all his Epistles to the Churches, except that to the *Galatians*. It's a cer-  
<sup>1</sup>tain Evidence he was neither Bishop there, nor Resident there. We find him long after this at *Rome*, and invited by the Apostle thither, that he might be help-

\* 1. Tim.

3. 14. 15.

& 4. 13.

† 1. Tim.

5. 13.

‡ 1. Pet.

4. 11.

§ 5.

helpful to him in the Ministry \* , from whence the Apostle intended to take him along with him to visit the Churches of *Judea* † : and was he Bishop of <sup>\* 2 Tim 4.  
9, 10, 11.</sup> *Rome* and *Judea* also? The truth is, he was no fixed Officer in any one place, but went up and down, sometimes as *Paul's Companion*, sometimes as his Messenger, to settle the Churches, as other Evangelists did. If Non-residency hath such a Patron, and *Timothy* hath taught Men, to leave their Churches year after year, and play the Pastors many hundred Miles distant, it may tempt us to dream that Non-residency is a Duty.

V. If he was not Bishop of *Ephesus*, when the first Epistle was written to him, he was none at all; for that Epistle is made the Foundation of his Episcopal Power. He was no Bishop of *Ephesus* when *Paul* took his last leave of the Presbyters there ||. He commits <sup>¶ Acts 20.</sup> to them the oversight of the Church, <sup>17, 28.</sup> as the proper Bishops of it, without the least mention of *Timothy*, though he was then present \*. The whole Episcopal Power is given to the Presbyters, <sup>\* Acts 20.  
4, 5, 6, 7.</sup> before their supposed Bishop's face: or if <sup>13, 14.</sup>

V.

he had not been there at that time, how comes *Paul* to be so regardless (when he concluded he should never see their Faces any more \*) as not to name his Successor? was he only ignorant of the

<sup>\* Ib. v. 25.</sup> prophecies concerning *Timothy* †. If he

<sup>† 1 Tim. 4. 14.</sup> had not been qualified for this Office

<sup>1 Tim. 1.</sup> 18. now, he might have given the Presby-

ters of *Ephesus* some hints concerning the Prophecies that went before on him, of his future usefulness as a Bishop in that Church. But why should any imagine so worthy a Person not qualified for this Undertaking? He that was qualified to be the Apostle's Messenger to so many

<sup>|| 1 Cor. 4. 17. & 17.</sup> Churches ||, whom St. *Paul* styles his Work-fellow \*, and whose name he

<sup>\* Rom. 16. 14. & 18. 5.</sup> joyns with his own in his Epistles

21. written to several Churches †, could

<sup>† 2 Cor. 1. 1. Thess. 1. 1.</sup> not want a Character to render

<sup>1. 1.</sup> him worthy of this Charge at *E-*

<sup>2 Thess. 1. 1.</sup> *phesus*. How then comes the Apostle

to over-look him, and to fix the Go-

<sup>2 Thess. 1. 1.</sup> vernment in the Presbyters of that

<sup>|| Act. 20. 28.</sup> Church ||? He told the Elders of *Epe-*

<sup>ssus</sup> at *Miletus*, that he had not spar'd to

<sup>2 Thess. 1. 1.</sup> declare unto them all the Counsel of God.

<sup>1 Cor. 1. 1.</sup> How can this be, when he neglects to

<sup>1 Cor. 1. 1.</sup> inform them about his ordinary Suc-

<sup>cessor?</sup>

cessor? If Ministry and Churches depend upon this Succession, 'twas no small part of the Counsel of God to be declar'd unto them. He tells them he knew they should never see his face any more<sup>IV</sup>. Whether he did see them again, \* Acts 20. or no, is not material to the point. 'Tis certain he thought he should not; how then comes he to leave them as Sheep without a Shepherd, to defend them against those Wolves that should enter after his departure †? The reason is obvious, he thought the Presbyters of E. p̄f̄s̄ fit for this undertaking, without a superior Bishop. <sup>+ Acts 20. 29. V. 28.</sup>

Thus we see that *Timothy* was no Bishop at this time, nor had the Apostle pointed at him as his intended Successor, but the first Epistle to *Timothy* (upon which his pretended Episcopacy is built) was written before this time; therefore no power given him in that Epistle, can prove him to be a Bishop.

That this Epistle was written before his Imprisonment at *Rome*, when he went to *Macedonia* ||, is acknowledg'd by Bishop *Hall*\*, though he was a zealous Defender of the *Jus Divinum* of <sup>1, 2, 4.</sup> <sup>1 Tim. 3, 3.</sup> <sup>\* vind. p. Epis. 97.</sup>

Episcopacy. Of this Opinion is *Aba-*  
*nactus*, *Theodoret*, *Baronius*, *Ludov.*  
*Capellus*, *Grotius*, *Hammond*, *Lightfoot*,  
*Cary*, &c.

VI. VI. If *Timothy* was Bishop of *Ephe-*  
*sus* when the first Epistle was written to  
<sup>a</sup>*Tim. 4.12* him, how comes he to be absent from  
*Ephesus*, when *Paul* writ the second E-  
 pistle to him? was *Timothy* a Non-resi-  
 dent Bishop? *Paul* sends *Tychicus* to *E-*  
*phesus* with an Epistle to the Church  
 there, but not a word of *Timothy* their  
 Bishop in the whole Epistle, but *Tychicus*  
 is recommended to them as a faithful  
 Minister in the Lord, *Eph. 6. 21, 22*.  
 This was after the writing of the first  
 Epistle to him, when he is supposed to  
 be Bishop there, even when the second  
 Epistle was written to him, <sup>2</sup>*Tim. 4.12*.  
 If any could imagine this Epistle to have  
 found *Timothy* in *Ephesus*, how comes  
 the Apostle to call him away from his  
 Charge? <sup>2</sup>*Tim. 4.9*. They that say, it  
 was to receive his dying words, must  
 prove it. The Apostle gives another  
 reason, <sup>2</sup>*Tim. 4.10, 11*. that he had only  
*Luke* with him of all his Compani-  
 ons, and therefore desires him to come  
 to him, and to bring *Mark* with him, as  
 being

being profitable to him for the Ministry. He sends for *Titus* to come to him to *Nicopolis* (*Tit. 3. 12.*) from his supposed Bishoprick of *Creet*, and was he to receive his dying words there also, about fourteen years before his death? for that Epistle was written in the Year of Christ 55. and *Nero's* *1. vid. Lightf. harm. Vol. I. p. 309.* Nay, how comes the Apostle to send him afterwards to *Dalmatia*? *2 Tim. 4. 10.* was he Bishop there also? I question whether Non-residency was allowed of, much less enjoyned to such stated Church-Officers as *Timothy* and *Titus* are feigned to be.

It is true, some of the Fathers say, they were Bishops of those places. But it's considerable that *Eusebius* saith no more, then *isogū* (ισογού), it is reported that *Timothy* was the first Bishop of *Ephesus*. He doth not affirm it. *Theodoret* calls him Ἀπόστολος Δούτος οὐδεὶς, so he calls *Titus*, ἀρχιτεκτόνης Δούτος οὐδεὶς, and yet few will take them for real Apostles. They say also that *Peter* was Bishop of *Rome*, yet many of our Protestant Writers deny it; so doth \* *Reynolds* against *Hart*, and \* *Reynolds* Dr. *Barrow* of the *Supremacy*. The Fathers and Councils speak of the Officers <sup>against Hart, p.</sup> *110, 111—*

of former times, according to the style  
of their own.

To conclude; If *Timothy* and *Titus*  
be not Bishops of the English Species,  
then there were no such in the Apostles  
times. That *Timothy* was not such, we  
have proved; and if *Timothy* was not,  
no more was *Titus*, whose power and  
work was the same with *Timothy's*. If  
the power of Ordination, invested in *Ti-  
mothy* at *Ephesus*, doth not prove him  
Bishop there, no more doth the same  
power given to *Titus* in *Creet*, *Tit.* 1. 3.  
prove him Bishop there.

## VII.

VII. But suppose *Timothy* and *Titus*  
were real Bishops, or fixed Pastors of  
*Ephesus* and *Creet*, it will be no Argu-  
ment for Diocesan Bishops, except the  
Church of *Ephesus*, and that of *Creet*  
did appear to be of the same extent  
with our Diocesan Churches, which can  
never be proved. Did the Church of  
*Ephesus* consist of one hundred or two  
hundred Parishes, or particular Congre-  
gations, under the conduct of their pro-  
per Presbyters, which were all subject  
to *Timothy*, as their Bishop? This must  
be prbved, or the instance of *Timothy's*  
being Bishop of *Ephesus* will be imper-  
tinent

tinent to the present Case. Nay, there are strong presumptions that the Church of Ephesus consisted of no more Members than could ordinarily meet in one place. That Church had but one Altar, at which the whole Congregation ordinarily received the Lord's Supper, in Ignatius his time \*, which was many years \* *Ignat. Ep. ad Ephes.*  
after Timothy's death. Σπεδαρέτε εγ<sup>ν</sup> ad Ephes.  
*Voss. Edit.*  
πυκνήσαο συνιεχεῖσθαι εἰς τὸ χαροπλάνον Θεόν, p. 25.  
η, εἰς δόξαν, ὅτι εἰς τὸ πυκνόν ὅτι τὸ αὐτὸν γνωστό, καθαύγεσθαι τὸ δικαίομενον τὸ οὐαταρά, &c. Give diligence therefore to assemble together frequently for the Eucharist of God, and for praise, for when you often come into one place, the powers of Satan are destroyed, &c. I render ὅτι τὸ αὐτὸν into one place, as our English Translators do, Acts 2. 1. He saith also, 'Ο γὰρ μὴ εἰρχθεὶς ὅτι τὸ αὐτὸν, ἀδικοεπανεῖ, νο<sup>ν</sup> εἰσὶν διεργίεις. He therefore that co- p. 20.  
meth not to the same place, is proud and condemneth himself. In his Epistle to the Magnesians, he mentions one Altar, which further explains his meaning †: Πάντες ἐνώς εἰς τὸν συνιεχεῖσθαι Θεόν, ὡς ὅτι ἐν Δυνατήσιον. Let all of *Magn. Ep. 34.*  
you come together, as into the Temple of God, as unto one Altar. The meaning of

## A PLEA for

of one Altar is plain in ancient Authors.

Cyprian calls separate Communions the

\* Cyp. Ep. setting up *Altare contra Altare*<sup>\*</sup>: To be *intro Altare*, is to be in Church Communion; to be *extra Altare*, is to be without.

The Bishop of *Salisbury* doth acknowledge that *Ignatius* his Bishop was only the Pastor of a particular Church; his words are these †: By the strain of *Ignatius his Epistles*, especially that to *Smyrna*, it would appear, that there was but one Church, at least but one place, where there was but one Altar and Communion, in each of these Parishes, [which was the Bishops whole Charge.]

And if so, then the Church of *Ephesus*, to whom he directed one of his Epistles, was of no larger extent, except we imagine it was decreased in *Ignatius's* time from what it was in *Timothy's* days, which is absurd. The Christians were rather more numerous in the next Age, than they were in the Apostles time. And yet we find in the beginning of the fourth Century the Believers, in greater Cities than *Ephesus*, were no more then could meet in one place, or in two at the most. For Constantine

† Barn.  
Vindic. of  
the Ch. of  
Scotland,  
p. 51.

stantine the Great thought two Temples sufficient for all the Christians in his Royal City of Constantinople; the one he called the Temple of the Apostles; *Ut doceret Scripturas, Apostolorum doctrinam* fundamentum, in Templo predicandas est: the other he called, the Temple of Peace; *Quia Concilii Nicæni Opera quod celebrandum curaverat, Ecclesia pacem restituerat, & Arrianorum impios controvistas compescuerat.* Constantius added one more; and there were but five Temples in that great City, that was little inferior to Rome, in the days of Justinian. See Gentileius his Exam. Concil. Trid. lib. 5. sect. 48. Some of our greater Parishes have as many Chappels, or Places of Publick Worship, as there were Temples in Constantinople, which are but a small part of an English Diocels. But the Learned Mr. Baxter, and Mr. Clarkson, have so fully proved the English Species of Episcopacy to be destructive of the Scripture and Primitive Form, that until they be solidly answered, we will take it for granted, that it is a Humane Creature which grew up as the Man of Sin did, and owes it's being to the meer favour of Secular Powers, who

Trip. Hist.  
lib. 2. c. 18.  
in Gent.  
Exam.  
p. 399.

## A P L E A for

can as easily reduce it to it's primitive Nothing.

Some have pretended to make Bishops of the seven Asian Angels, when they have proved their power of Jurisdiction, and the extent of their Diocesses to be the same with ours, they shall be heard. The state of *Ephesus*, one of the seven Asian Churches, we have seen already, by which we may guess at the rest.

The Church of *Smyrna*, another of the seven Churches of *Asia*, consisted of a single Congregation that ordinarily worshipped and communicated in one place. Πάντες τῷ ἀποστόλῳ ἀκολουθεῖτε, ὡς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τῷ Πατερὶ, καὶ τῷ Πρεσβύτερῳ τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις, τοῖς δὲ Διάκονοις, εὐρέπεια ὡς Θεῷ στολῶν. Μηδέτες γένεται τῷ ἀποστόλῳ τῇ περιστρέψει τῷ αντίτερῳ τῷ Ἐγκλήσιῳ. Let all follow the Bishop, as Jesus Christ doth the Father, and the Presbytery as the Apostles, and reverence the Deacons as God's Commandment. Let none manage any Church matters without the Bishop. And a little after he adds, ὅπερ ἀναρτήσας ὁ ἀπόστολος, ἵξει τὸ πνῖθιστον, ωμένη ὅπερ ἦν ὁ Χριστὸς ἴνος, ἵξει ἡ καρδιὰ σκληρίζεσθαι. εἰς τὸν

Epist. ad  
Smyr p.6.

Ἐὰν χωρὶς τῆς ὀποκείτης, ἐπιβασιλέων, ἐπι-  
ἀρχηπέπων ποιεῖν. Where the Bishop is, there  
let the Multitude be, even as where Christ  
is, there the Catholick Church is; it is  
not lawful without the Bishop either to  
baptize, or to make Love-feasts. Here  
it is evident, 1. That the Multitude,  
which were the Bishops Flock, ordina-  
rily worshipped God together. 2. That  
they did this under the conduct of their  
respective Bishop, who was ordinarily  
present with every Church Assembly.  
3. That he was the ordinary Admini-  
strator of Baptism to his Flock, which  
he could not do, had it been as large as  
our present Dioceses. 4. That the same  
Assemblies had a Bishop, Presbyters and  
Deacons: For the same Multitude is to  
follow the same Bishop, Presbyters, and  
Deacons; and how could one Parish  
follow all the Presbyters of all other  
Parish Churches of a Diocese whom  
they never knew? \*

*Ignatius's Epistle to Polycarp,* who was then Bishop of Smyrna, makes it more evident, that he was Bishop of a single Congregation, Πληθυ-  
τογροφιῶν συνεταγμένη γενεδωματα. οἵ δὲ ὄντος αὐτοῦ πατέρας ζητεῖ, δέλτας καὶ δέλτας μὴ ἀπερ-  
ράφει. *Keep frequent Congregations, inquire*

## A PLEA for

quire after all by name, despise not Men-servants and Maid-servants. I leave it to such as are willing to understand the Truth, to consider how great Poly-carps Church then was, when the Bishop himself was to look after every one by name, even the Men-servants and the Maids.

We find by Ignatius's Epistle to the *Philadelphians* (another of these Churches) that the Angel of the Church of *Philadelphia* had no larger a Diocess than those of *Ephesus* and

\* *Ignat.ad Smyrna* \* : Σπεδαίτε ἐν μιᾷ ἀχριστικῇ χεῖρας, μιᾷ τῷ σάρξ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἐν ποτίσιον εἰς ἑκαπά τῷ ἀμαλὲτε. ἐν Δυναστήριον, καὶ εἰς Ἐπικοπὲν ἀματαρὸν πρεσβύτερον καὶ διάκονοις τοῖς σωματοῖς μα. Study therefore to use one Eucharist [or Eucharistical Communion] for there is one Flesh [or Body] of our Lord Jesus Christ, [which is represented in the Sacramental Bread] and one Cup [which is Sacramentally given] into the union of his Blood, one Altar, one Bishop, with the Presbytery, and the Deacons my fellow Servants. Nothing can be more full than this Testimony: They are all to joyn in one Assembly for

for the Eucharist, and there must be but one Altar for this Communion, and one Bishop, and one Presbytery with the Deacons with him; and such a Bishop is a Parish Minister or Rector, assisted by his Curates and Deacons, the latter of which were originally instituted to serve Tables, *Act 6.*

II. *Tyconius's* old Exposition mentioned by *Austin*, hath not been yet disproved, which is this, That by the Angels are meant the whole Churches, and not any single Persons: *Aug. lib. 3. 30. de Doctr. Christian.* The whole style of the Text countenances this Exposition; for as every Message begins with (*To the Angel*) so it endeth with (*To the Churches.*)

III. In the Contents of our authorized Bibles they are expounded *Ministers*. By which we may understand the sense of the Old Church of *England*, agreeable to many of the Ancients; such as *Aretas, Primaagus, Ambrose, Gregory the Great, Bede, Haymo*, and many more.

Scripture is it's own best Interpreter; we find there that the Church of *Ephesus*, over which one of these Angels presided, had several Bishops in it, and

Acts 20.  
17. 28.

## A PLEA for

all the other Churches had several Ministers in them, as will be acknowledg'd by our Antagonists : Now these other Ministers are included, either under the name of Candlesticks, and so reckoned among the People, which is absurd ; or under the name of Stars and Angels. Many may be intended by one Angel, as afterward by one Beast, *cap. 13.* and one Head, *cap. 17.* It's remarkable, that it is spoken of the Candlesticks, *the seven Candlesticks are the seven Churches* ; but of the Stars it's said indefinitely, *the seven Stars are the Angels* (not seven Angels) of *the seven Churches*.

Rev. 1.20.

IV. IV. Angel is a name of Office, and not of Order, as is agreed by the Learned ; it is a strange Consequence, *To the Angel of the Church of Ephesus*, therefore the Angel was a Bishop, and had Authority over other Ministers. St. John placeth the Presbyters next the Throne Rev. 5.11. of Christ himself, and the Angels further off at a greater distance ; shall we therefore say that the Presbyters are more honourable then the Bishops ? the Inference is much more natural then the other, if Angels be Bishops, as our

Ad-

Adversaries affirm. St. Paul prefers the preaching, before the ruling Presbyter. <sup>1 Tim. 5. 17.</sup>

V. It's observed by many Chronologers, that *Timothy* was alive when the Epistle to the Angel of the Church of *Ephesus* was written, and shall we think <sup>Rev. 2. 2.</sup> that he had left his first love, whom *Paul* so often commends for his Zeal and Diligence in the Work of God.

VI. To put this matter out of doubt, St. John, a Jew, calls the Ministers of Particular or Parochial Churches, *the Angels of the Churches*, in the style of the Jewish Church, who call'd the Publick Minister of every Synagogue <sup>vid. Lights</sup> *שְׁלֵיח צָבָר* <sup>Vol. 2.</sup> *the Angel of the Church.* <sup>p. 133.</sup> They call'd him also *חִזּוּן הַכְּנֹסֶת* <sup>Enioso-</sup> *πατρι*, or *Bishop of the Congregation*. Every Synagogue, or Congregation, had its *Bishop*, or *Angel of the Church*. Now the Service and Worship of the Temple being abolished, as being Ceremonial, God transplanted the Worship and Publick Adoration used in the Synagogues, which was Moral, into the Christian Church, to wit, the Publick Ministry, Publick Prayers, reading God's Word, and Preaching, &c. Hence the names of the Ministers of the Gospel were

were the very same ; the *Angel of the Church*, and the *Bishop*, which belong'd to the Ministers in the Synagogues. We love Bishops so well, that we could wish we had as many Bishops as there are Parishes in *England*, as the Jewish Synagogues had, to which St. John alludes, when he calls them *Angels of the Churches*.

In sum , If Presbyters be Scripture Bishops, as we have proved, and Diocesan Bishops have no footing there, as hath been evinced, then our Ordinations are *Jure Divino*, and therefore valid.

C H A P. III.

*Instances of Ordination by Presbyters in Scripture. St. Paul and Barnabas Ordain'd by Presbyters. Their Ordination a Pattern to the Gentile Churches, Acts 13. 1, 2, 3 vindicated. Turrianus's Evasion confuted. Timothy Ordained by Presbyters, 1 Tim. 4, 14 explained. The Particles dia and μετα used promiscuously.*

**T**HAT Ordination of which we Arg. II. have Scripture Examples is valid, but of Ordination by Presbyters we have Scripture Examples, therefore Ordination by Presbyters is valid. The Major I hope will not be denied, it carries its own Evidence with it to such as are willing to be guided by the practise of Apostolical Churches, which is the first, and best Antiquity. The Minor thus prove, St. Paul and Barnabas were Ordained.

## A PLEA for

dained by Presbyters, *Acts 13. 1, 2, 3.*  
so was *Timothy*, *1 Tim. 4. 14.*

These two Instances deserve a more particular consideration. Concerning the first, in *Acts 13.* these two things are evident : 1. That *Luke* speaks of Ordination, he mentions the separating of *Paul* and *Barnabas* to a Ministerial Work, by Fasting and Prayer, with the Laying on of Hands ; and what more can be done in Ordination ? It's true, they had an extraordinary Call before, *Gal. 1. 1.* yet being now to plant the Gospel among the Gentiles, they enter upon their Work at the ordinary Door of Ordination. Dr. *Lightfoot* thinks it was for this reason, *That the Lord hereby might set down a Plat-form of Ordaining Ministers to the Church of the Gentiles to future times.*

2. The Ordainers were Prophets and Teachers, *Acts 13. 1, 2.* Now Teachers are ordinary Presbyters, who are distinguished from Prophets and other extraordinary Officers, both in *1 Cor. 12. 28.* and in *Epb. 4. 12.* Every Presbyter is a Teacher by Office. *Turrianus* the Jesuit thinks to avoid the force of this quotation, by affirming the Prophets men-

more  
erning  
hings  
ks. of  
rating  
terial  
th the  
more  
true,  
before,  
t the  
enter  
Door  
ks it  
bere-  
dain-  
Gen.  
  
and  
ach-  
are  
ther  
*Cor.*  
ref-  
*nus*  
e of  
nets  
en-

mentioned in this Ordination to have been Bishops, and the Teachers to have been meer Presbyters, and that these Presbyters were *Paul* and *Barnabas*, who were now created Bishops. But this is a most ridiculous evasion. Was St. *Paul*, the chief of Apostles, but a meer Presbyter? was he inferior to *Lucius*, *Niger*, and *Manaeus*? Apostles were superior to Prophets, much more to Teachers, *1 Cor. 12.28.* The Prophets here could not be Bishops, because they were extraordinary Officers, and there were more then one in this Church, and in the Church of *Corinth*, *1 Cor. 14.29.* Neither is there any ground in the Text of this distribution, that Teachers should refer to the Ordained, and Prophets to the Ordainers. This is a meer fiction of the Jesuit to support the Cause of Prelacy.

If any say, This separation of *Paul* and *Barnabas* was not to the Office of the Ministry, but to a special Exercise of it. I answer, it doth not alter the Case: For here are all the outward Actions of an Ordination properly so called, Fasting, Prayer, with Imposition of Hands to a Ministerial Work. Now the

Que-

## A PLEA for

Question is, Who have power to perform these Actions? here the Presbyters do it. They to whom all the outward Actions of Ordination belong, to them the Ordaining Power belongs; as he that hath power to wash a Child with Water in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, hath power to Baptize; for what else is baptizing, but washing with Water in the Name of the Sacred Trinity for special Dedication to God? He that hath power to set apart Bread and Wine for Sacramental use, hath power to Administer the Lord's Supper: So here, they that have power to dedicate Persons to God for the Work of the Ministry by Fasting, Prayer, and Imposition of Hands, have power of Ordination. It's true, a Lay-Patron may give one power to exercise his Ministry, that cannot give the Office; but can he do this by repeating all the solemn Acts of Ordination? Can he use the same form of Ordination with the Ordaining Bishop? Can he lay hands upon the Person ordained, and by Fasting and Prayer devote him to God in the Publick Congregation? I think none will affirm it. If he cannot invest a Person

by

per by repeating the whole form of Ordination, because he is a Lay-man, and hath not the Ordaining Power, therefore they that can use the form of Ordination have power to Ordain. The Bishops would not like it, if all those that are Ordained by them in *Scotland* should be declared incapable of Exercising their Office there, until they were admitted by a Classis of Presbyters with Solemn Imposition of Hands. It would scarce satisfie them to say, That the Presbyters imposed Hands only to empower the Person in the Exercise of his Office, and not to give the Office it self, when they performed all the outward Actions of Ordination, which are the ordinary means of conveying the Office.

I proceed to the second Instance of Ordaining Presbyters mentioned in *1 Tim. 4. 14 Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the bands of the Presbytery.* Here *Timothy* is Ordained by the Presbytery; nothing can be more express then this Testimony. Two things are usually objected to this Scripture.

Object.

## A PLEA for

Obj. I.

*Object.* 1. By Πρεσβυτήριον is meant the Office of Presbytery, and not the Colledge of Presbyters, saith *Turrianus* the Jesuit, who is followed by some Protestants.

*Answe.* I answer; The word Πρεσβυτήριον is never taken in this sense in the New Testament; it always signifies a Company of Presbyters; see *Luke* 22. 66. *Acts* 22.5. *Presbyterium* is used by *Cyprian* for a Consistory of Elders, *Lib. 2. Ep. 8. & 10. Cornelius*, Bishop of *Rome*, in an Epistle to *Cyprian*, saith, *Omnis actu, ad me perlato, placuit contrahi Presbyterium: Adsuernunt etiam Episcopi quinque, &c.* The Office of Presbytery is expressed by *πρεσβύτεριον*.

2. What sense can be made of the Text according to this Interpretation?

Vid. *Canter Myroth.* Neglect not the gift — given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the office of Presbytery. Hands belong to the Persons, and not to the Office. Nor can πρεσβύτεριον be the Genitive Case to χαρίωντα. Neglect not the gift — of the office of Presbytery; for προφητίας and ἀνθρώπων τῷ χειρῶν come between. Thus the Text, Μὴ ἀμέλει τὸ εἰς σοι χαρίωντα, οὐ εἰδότης τοῦ δικῆς

*προστίλας, μετὰ διδόνως τῷ χειρῶν τῷ πρεσβυτηρίᾳ.* To refer πρεσβυτηρίᾳ to χειρῶν @ would invert the natural order of the words, which is not to be done without evident necessity, otherwise the Scriptures may be made a Nose of Wax, and the clearest Expressions wrested to a contrary sense by such Transpositions and Dislocations.

3. But suppose this sense were admitted, and πρεσβυτηρίῳ be taken for the Office of Presbytery, it will not prejudice our Argument; for it will follow, that *Timothy* was but a meer Presbyter by Office, and that it belongs to the Office of a Presbyter to impose Hands for Ordination, because *Timothy*, a Presbyter, did so, *i Tim. 5. 22.* So that whether we understand the place of a *Bench of Presbyters* Ordaining *Timothy*; or, of the Office of a Presbyter, into which *Timothy* was Ordained, and by virtue of which he had power to Ordain others, it equally proves our assertion, that meer Presbyters did Ordain.

Objec. 2. *Timothy* was Ordained by Obj. 2. *Paul*, with the concurrence of the Presbyters. *Non excluduntur Presbyteri ab Inter Op. impositione manus approbante, sed ab im-* <sup>9ad.p.788.</sup> *positione*

## A PLEA for

*potitione manus ordinante*, saith the Jesuit; who is followed by some of our own; they say, The efficacy of *Timothy's Presbyteratus* was in *Paul*, as in a Bishop (and therefore he saith in 2 Tim. 1. 6. διὰ τὸ θεόν τῷ χειρὶ με) and in the Presbyters by a bare concurrence, and therefore it's said μέσα τὸ θεόν τῷ χειρὶ τοῦ πρεσβυτεροῦ. Διὰ denotes Authority, and μέσα a mere Instrumentality.

Answ.

Answ. It cannot be denied but *Paul* laid hands upon *Timothy*, 2 Tim. 1. 6. but how doth it appear that it was for Ordination? it might be, for any thing appears to the contrary, for the confering of the Holy Ghost, which was given by the Laying on of the Apostles Hands, Acts 8. 17, 18. But if he laid Hands for Ordination, it's certain he joyned the Presbyters with him, which he had not done, if there had not been an inherent Power of Ordination in Presbyters as such. The Apostles did not assume to themselves the sole Power of Ordination, but took the Presbyters for their Associates in this Action. *Paul* joyns *Barnabas* with him, Acts 14. 23. who, if he were one of the Seventy Disciples

Disciples (as *Dorotheus* affirms, with whom agrees *Eusebius*) then was he of the Order of Presbyters, according to *Dorotheus* *Synops.* *Euseb. lib.* *I.c. 12.*

that Hypothesis that makes Bishops to succeed the twelve Apostles, and Presbyters the Seventy Disciples, and so we have another Example of a Presbyter ordaining. The like must be said of *Timothy*, who laid on Hands in *Ephesus*, not without the Presbyters joyning with him, who were made Bishops there by the Holy Ghost, *Acts 20. 17, 28.* He would not assume a greater Power to himself then *Paul* did; but *Paul* joyned the Presbyters with him in the Act of Ordination, therefore *Timothy* did the like.

Nothing can be gathered from the Particle *διὰ* applied to *Paul's* Act, and *μετὰ* as applied to the Presbyters Act, for they are used promiscuously in the *New Testament*, and the signification of them must be determined by the subject matter. *Διὰ περιπλεῖας*, in *1 Tim. 4. 14.* respects the moving Cause that encouraged *Paul*, with the Presbyters, to lay Hands on *Timothy*; see *1 Tim. 1. 18.*

But usually *διὰ* with a Genitive Case signifies an instrumental working, or efficiency.

ficiency. See Matth. 8. 17. That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the Prophet. We are said to be justified by works, Rom. 3. 30. It signifies also a way, or medium, that respects a certain end. See Matth. 2. 12. the G 7. 13. & 12. 43.

I find μέση and διά used promiscuously in Acts 15. 4, 12. G 14. 27. μετ' αὐτῷ by them, is rendered δι' αὐτῷ in v. 12. and yet the same thing is intended, viz. what God did by them as Instruments.

Paul's διὰ διδόνεως χειρῶν, and the Presbyters μετὰ διδόνεως — do equally imply an instrumental efficiency. For all Ordainers are Ministerial Deliverers of Possession, and none of them principal efficient Donors, Christ is the Authoritative Giver of the Ministerial Power, by his Law, which is the Fundamentum Juris. As the King's Charter to a Corporation determines who shall be capable of being Mayor, how he shall be chosen, and how invested, here the Mayor's Power is immediately from the King's Charter, as the efficient constitutive Instrument, and all that others do is but to determine of the Recipient, and Invest

it. it. Invest him : so the Lord Jesus Christ hath  
died in his Law determined the Office  
of the Ministry, the qualifications of the  
Persons, and how they are to be separa-  
tated for the Work, all that belongs to  
the Ordainers is but ministerially to In-  
vest a capable Recipient. They are no  
Efficients of the Power, that is immedi-  
ately from Christ's Law, which is the  
Fountain and Measure of their Pow-  
er.

Thus the Presbyters, in the purest  
and first Age of the Church, had the  
Ordaining Power, which they kept  
for a considerable time, as we shall see  
For anion, though as the Church degenera-  
ed from the first Purity, and the num-  
ber of Presbyters increased, one was  
chosen, as President of the rest, who  
should Impose Hands in the Name of  
his Collegues. Hence the Superior  
Dignity of Bishops, who at length  
subjected not only to their Hands, but  
to their Feet also, not Presbyters alone,  
but Sovereign Princes and Emperours,  
that we may not forget the Bishop  
(of Rome) so that at length the poor  
Presbyters were no more then the  
Bishops

*A PLEA for*

Bishops Curates, as our Liturgy distinguisheth them, in the Prayer for Bishops and Curates. The easiest and more honourable Parts of the Ministerial Work (as they were reckon'd) they reserved in their own hands; and committed the rest to their Presbyters.

---

**CHAP**The page features a large, ornate initial letter 'T' at the bottom right corner, which is part of a decorative border or a chapter heading.

## CHAP. IV.

Presbyters have power of Ordination, because they have power to Preach, Baptize, and Administer the Lord's Supper. These are not inferior to Ordination, proved from the Nature of these Acts, from Christ's Commission, from the Sense of the Ancients. Object. The Apostles reserved Ordination to themselves and Successors. Answ. 1. They joyned the Presbyters with them. 2. The Apostles as such had no Successors, prov'd from the Peculiarities of their Office, from the Testimonies of Sadeel, Barrow, Lightfoot. Another Objection answered.

They who have power to Preach Arg. III.  
the Gospel, to Baptize, and Administer the Lord's Supper, have pow-  
E 2 er

## A PLEA for

er of Ordination, but meer Presbyters have power to Preach, Baptize, and Administer the Lord's Supper, therefore they have power of Ordination.

The Major only requires proof, which I thus prove ; Preaching, Baptizing, and Administiring the Lord's Supper are Ministerial Acts not of an inferior Nature to Ordination , & *parvum par est ratio*. That they are not inferior to Ordination appears both from the nature of the thing , and from Scripture. It appears,

I. From the nature of the thing it self. Let us consider each apart : As to Preaching the Gospel Authoritatively in the Name of Christ, it's a most glorious Ordinance ; the Publishers of it are called Ambassadors for Christ, 2 Cor. 5. 20. And is an Ordainer any thing more ? In the Act of Preaching they represent the Lord Jesus Christ, the great Prophet of the Church, Matth. 10. 40. and can any thing be more honourable ? They are said to be workers together with God, 2 Cor. 6. 1. and is an Ordainer more then this ?

As to Baptism , It's a solemn dedication of a Person to God ; Ordination

is no more; only the former is to Christianity as such, the latter to a particular work. In this, Baptism hath the preference, for it is a Sacramental Dedication, which Ordination is not.

In the Lord's Supper, the Minister sets apart Bread and Wine, as Symbolical Representations of Jesus Christ, who is exhibited with all his Benefits to worthy Receivers. *Jerom* saith of Presbyters, *Ad quorum preces, Corpus & Sanguis Christi conficitur.* Now which is greater, to impose Hands, or to make the Sacramental Body and Blood of Christ? If they have power to consecrate holy Things, why not holy Persons also?

2. It will appear from Scripture that the Ministerial Acts now mentioned are not inferiour to Ordination. When St. Paul saith, *1 Cor. 1. 17. That Christ did not send him to baptize, but to preach the Gospel,* surely he means one of the highest Ministerial Acts, else he would have said, *Christ sent me neither to baptize, nor to preach, but to ordain Ministers.* I would fain know, whether Christ did not mention the chiefest parts of a Ministers work in the Commission

2.

## A PLEA for

given in Matth. 28. 19, 20. *Go teach all Nations, baptizing them, &c.* If Ordination had been the main and chiefest part, he would have said, *Go, ordain Ministers, preach, and baptize.* Christ's not mentioning it, is an Argument that it is not the principal part of a Minister's Office, but rather subordinate to preaching and baptizing, and therefore included here, as the lesser in the greater, though not expressed. A Commission usually specifies the Principal Acts which a Person is empower'd to do, when others of an inferiour Nature may be implied. Commissions do not run *à minori ad majus*, a superior Office may include the Duties of an Inferior, but not on the contrary. It is the rather to be presumed Christ would have mentioned the Ordaining Power in the Ministers Commission, if it had been superior to Preaching and Baptizing, because the Commission was immediately directed to the Apostles, whose Successors Diocesan Bishops pretend to be, and from whom they derive the Ordaining Power, as proper to themselves.

It may be, it will be said, That administering the Lord's Supper is not men-

mentioned in their Commission, though it be not inferior to Preaching and Baptizing. True, but the not mentioning of it, is an Argument it is not a greater Ministerial Act then those that are mentioned, and that it is not to be Administred by Officers superior to those that Preach and Baptize, but that the same Persons may Preach, Baptize, and Administer the Lord's Supper. The same I say of Ordination, it's not being expressed here is a sign it is not greater then those Ministerial Acts that are mentioned, and that they that have power to Preach and Baptize, have also to Ordain. Though this Objection be grounded on a Mistake of the Text, for the Lord's Supper is mentioned in the following words of the Commission, *Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, among which the Lord's Supper is one, Matth. 26. 26, 27.*

3. The Ancients argued from Baptism to Ordination, as is observed by <sup>Lamb. 1. 4</sup> <sup>distinct.</sup> <sup>25.</sup> the Master of the Sentences.

*Objec.* Some may say, The Power of Ordination is denied to Presbyters, not because Ordination is greater then other

Ministerial Acts, but because the Apostles thought fit to reserve it to themselves, and proper Successors, who are Diocesan Bishops.

*Answ.*

This is to beg the Question. We have proved already that the Apostles reserved not the Power of Ordination to themselves, but joyned the Presbyters with them. Nor are the Bishops the Apostles Successors as such, for the Apostles had their Call immediately from Heaven, *Gal. 1. 1.* had extraordinary qualifications, could confer the Holy Ghost, were infallibly assisted in their Ministerial Conduct, and were Universal Officers, none of which can belong to Diocesan Bishops. The Apostles were not tied to any one Nation, Province, or City; they were to preach the Gospel to all Nations; but they ordained Presbyters or Bishops in every Church, *Acts 14. 23.* or City, *Tit. 1. 5.* to whom they committed the ordinary Government of the Church: These were not sent to preach the Gospel to all Nations, but to feed the particular Flock, over which the Holy Ghost made them Bishops, *Acts 20. 28.* Now these stated particular, and fixed Church-Officers

Officers vastly differ from universal, unlimited, and unfixed Officers. You may as well say, that a petty Constable, whose power is confined to the narrow limits of a little Village, succeeds the King, who governs a whole Kingdom. When I see Bishops immediately sent of God, infallibly assisted by the Holy Ghost, travelling to the remotest Kingdoms to preach the Gospel in their own Language to the Infidel Nations, and confirming their Doctrine by undoubted Miracles, I shall believe them to be the Apostles true Successors in the Apostolic Office.

Our Learned Writers against the *Pa-* <sup>Sad. con-</sup> *pists* do unanimously deny the Apostles, <sup>tra. Turr.</sup> *as such, to have any Successors. Nemo* <sup>P. 570.</sup> *sane nisi planè sit ἀδελογός, Apostola-  
tum cum Episcopatu confuderit, saith the  
Noble and Learned Sadeel.*

Dr. Barrow of *Supremacy*, p. 120, 121. *The Offices of an Apostle and of a Bishop are not in their nature well consistent, for the Apostleship is an extraordinary Office, charged with the instruction and government of the whole World. — Episcopacy is an ordinary standing Charge affixed to one place — Now he that hath such*

*such a general care can hardly discharge  
such a particular Office, and he that is fix-  
ed to so particular as Attendance, can  
hardly look well to so general a Charge.  
A disparagement to the Apostolical Min-  
istry, for him [Peter] to take upon him the  
Bishoprick of Rome, as if the King should  
become Mayor of London, as if the Bi-  
shop of London should be Vicar of Pan-  
cras.* He saith a little before, St. Peter's  
being Bishop of Rome, would confound the  
Offices which God made distinct; for God  
did appoint first Apostles, then Prophets,  
then Pastors and Teachers; wherefore  
St. Peter, after he was an Apostle, could  
not well become a Bishop, it would be  
such an irregularity, as if a Bishop should  
be made a Deacon. To the same pur-  
pose speaks Dr. Lightfoot, who proves  
by several Arguments, That Apostles  
were an Order unimitable in the Church.

*Lightf.  
Vol. I.  
p. 187.*

*Object.* The Ordainers gave not the  
Ordaining Power to Presbyters, there-  
fore it belongs not to them.

*Answe.* They are Ordained to the Of-  
fice of the Ministry, of which the  
Ordaining Power is a Branch; It's not  
the intention of the Ordainer, but the  
Office as constituted by Christ, that

is

is the measure of the Power. The Ordaining Power is not mentioned in the Apostles Commission, *Mattb. 28. 20.* yet it is included in it. If Presbyters are sent to Preach and Baptize in the words of Christ's Commission to them, they are sent also to Ordain (as opportunities are offered to perform that Ministerial Act in a regular manner) for it's included in their Commission. Popish Ordainers did not intentionally give the Reforming Power to the first Reformers, yet no Protestant will question but it was annex to their Office as Ministers. Now the Office of the Ministry being from Christ, and not from Man, we must not go to the words of the Ordainer, but to the instituting Law of Christ, to know what the Office is. As if the City and Recorder should chuse Vide Bax-  
ter against  
Doddrit, and invest a Lord Mayor, and tell him, you shall not have all the Power given p. 30. by the King's Charter, it's a Nullity, he shall have all the Power that the Charter giveth him, by virtue of his Office.

## C H A P. V.

*The Ordinations of the greater part  
of the Reformed Churches are  
by Presbyters. Their not ha-  
ving superior Bishops cannot  
unchurch them ; nor is it a Case  
of Necessity, as is pretended by  
some : For, 1. They might have  
Bishops if they would. 2. Some  
of them refused them, when of-  
fered. 3. Their Learned Wri-  
ters assert an inherent Power in  
Presbyters to Ordain, and never  
use this Plea of Necessity.  
4. Their Confessions make all  
Ministers equal.*

Arg IV. **T**HAT Ordination which is the same with the Ordinations in the Reformed Churches beyond Sea, is valid, but such is Ordination by meer Presbyters, Therefore — If theirs be null,

null, and the Roman or Popish Ordinations valid, then it's better be of the Roman Popish Church, then of the Reformed; but the Consequence is absurd.

I know but two things can be replied to this Argument:

1. That the Reformed Churches have no true Ministers, for want of Episcopal Ordination. Thus Mr. *Dodwel* and others, who would have us believe the Romish Church to be a true Church, and receive the Pope as the Patriarch of the West. These Gentlemen have cast off their Vizard, and give us to know what they would be at. They condemn the forreign Reformed Churches as no Churches, their Sacraments as no Sacra- ments, and consequently no Salvation to be had in their Communion. Like the *Donatists* of old, they confine Sal- vation to their own Party and Way. It's unaccountable that any who call themselves Protestants, should unchurch the greatest and purest part of Reform'd Christians in favour of a Despotick Pre- lacy, which hath no foundation in Scrip- ture, or the best Antiquity. The being of Ministry and Churches must depend

upon

tipon a few Men, who look more like State-Ministers, than Ministers of Christ, and are generally more busie in managing Intrigues of Government, then *in preaching the word in season and out of season.* Can any imagine that such Pastors as rarely preach the Gospel, as not above once in three years visit their Flock, that have many thousands of Souls under their charge whose Faces they never saw, that assume to themselves a Grandeur more agreeable to the Princes of the World, then to the Simplicity and Humility required in the Ministers of the Gospel, that entangle themselves with the Affairs of this Life, contrary to the Scriptures and the Old Canons: I say, can any imagine such Pastors to be so necessary to the Church, that there must be neither Ministry, nor Sacraments, nor Worship of God, nor Salvation without them? O happy *Rome!* O miserable Reformed Churches! if the Case be thus.

*Matth. 20.  
25,26.*

*2 Tim. 2.4.  
Can. Ap. 7.  
& 8o.*

2. Others that are more moderate, say, The Case of the Reformed Churches is a Case of Necessity, they have no Bishops, nor can have them. Ordinations by meet Presbyters may be lawful, where Bishops cannot be had. I

I answer, 1. The Case of the foreign Churches is no Case of Necessity; for if they have a mind of Bishops, what hinders their having of them? Is it the Magistrates? It cannot be said of *Holland, Switzerland, Geneva, &c.* where they have Magistrates of their own. Suppose *France*, and some other places, would not have admitted of it, that should have been no bar to the Order, if they had been desirous of it. The primitive Christians were under Heathen Magistrates for three hundred years, who were generally professed Enemies to the Ministry and Churches, yet they wanted no Ministerial Order of Christ's appointment. Christ never appointed an Order of Ministers in his Church, which may not be had in the most difficult times. It's true, if the Civil Magistrate be against Bishops, it may eclipse their Lordly greatness, but it need not prejudice their *Jus Divinum*, if they have any. Why cannot the Apostles Successors subsist with as little dependence upon Authority, as the Apostles themselves did? Do Spiritual Men need Carnal Weapons to defend their Order? yet it cannot be denied, but that even

## A PLEA for

in France the Protestants had their Immunities, and a Polity of their own, by virtue of the *Edict of Nants*, which enabled them, had they pleas'd, to get Diocesan Bishops. They had their Synods for Church Government, and Moderators to preside in them ; and why not Bishops also, had they judged them necessary ? Nor is it to be supposed that their French Masters would have liked them the worse, for conforming to their own Ecclesiastical Government. *Thuanus*, a moderate Papist, thinks it was an Errour in their Constitution, that they neglected the superiour Order of Bishops in their first Reformation, for the supporting of their interest. The want of them did not prejudice their Constancy to the Truth, as appears by their late Sufferings.

2. Time hath been when the French Churches were earnestly sollicited, particularly by Bishop *Morton*, to receive a Clergy by the Ordination of the English Bishops, which they refused.

*Peter Moulin* in his Letter to the Bp. of *Winchester*, excusing himself for not making the difference betwixt Bishops and Presbyters to be of Divine appointment;

bx

be pleads, That if he had laid the difference on that foundation, the French Churches would have silenced him.

3. How come the Learned Writers of the foreign Churches, that vindicate their Ordinations against the Papists to forget this Plea of Necessity? They never say, *They would have Bishops, but cannot have them;* but they justify their Ordinations as according to Scripture, and assert an inherent Power in Presbyters as such to Ordain. This is undeniable to any body that reads their Discourses upon this Subject. See *Dassie*, Melancth.  
loc. com. *Moulin*, *Bucer*, *Voetius*, *Sadeel*, &c. that p. 234. *Muscetus*, Musc. loc.  
com. p. 199 *Zanchy*, Zanch. *Ravanel*, the *Leyden Professors*, Tom. 7.  
p. 537. *Ravan*. in verb. Epis.  
cop. *Synop. pur* &c. who all insist upon the Right of *Theolog.* p. 614. Presbyters to Ordain. It's true, of late years some Arts have been used to procure Letters from some eminent foreign Divines to condemn the Nonconformists here, without an impartial hearing of our Case. That we have been misrepresented to them, is evident by

Boch, Phal.  
& Cao. ad  
dend. p. 66. Dr. Morley's Letter to the famous Bo-  
chart, who vindicates us from the Do-  
ctor's Calumny. Some also have o-  
late submitted to Re-ordination, who are  
more to be pitied than censured, for  
they wanted Bread, and could have no  
Relief without Conforming to the  
Church of England; the Ceremonies,  
seems, being to some Men of more  
value than the great Gospel-Duty  
of Charity. That Charity which  
King of the Roman Communion im-  
power'd them to receive, though of a  
no other Religion, was denied them by  
Protestants of the same Religion, See L  
they did not conform to that Hierarchy  
which had no power over them, as being  
Natives of another Kingdom, and no  
way subject to our Constitution. See  
the first Brief for the French Prote-  
stants. Besides, that the French Min-  
isters hold Ordination but a Ceremony  
and may be reiterated twenty times  
there be occasion; and in their Necessity  
some of them have acted according  
to this Principle.

4. We may judge of the forreign  
Churches by their Confessions, which  
are the most Authentick Testimony o-  
the

Bo-  
Do-  
e o-  
o ar-  
, fo-  
ve n-  
th-  
ies,  
mor-  
Dury-  
ich-  
1 im-  
m b-  
n, L-  
bein-  
nd no-  
Se-  
Pro-  
Min-  
mon-  
mes-  
cessit-  
ordi-  
orreig-  
whic-  
ony  
the-  
heir sense about Episcopacy. The French Confession asserts an equality of Power in all Pastors. *Credimus omnes Pastores* Art. 30. *ubicunque collocați sunt, eadem & æquali potestate inter se esse præditos, sub uno solo capite, summoque & solo universalis Episcopo, Iesu Christo.* This is the more considerable, because no Man is to be Ordained a Minister, or admitted Elder or Deacon in the French Churches, but he must subscribe the Publick Confession of their Faith, and also the Constitutions agreed on at *Paris*, commonly known by the name of their Discipline. See *Durel*. p. 52. & *La Rocque's Confession of the French Discipline*, cap. I. art. 1. & cap. 3. art. 1.

The Dutch Confession speaks the same thing. *Cæterum ubicunque loco. Conf. Belg.*  
*um sunt Verbi Dei Ministri, eandem at-* Art. 31.  
*que æqualem omnes habent tum potestatem*  
*tum autoritatem, qui sunt æque omnes*  
*christi unici illius Universalis Episcopi,*  
*Capitis Ecclesiæ, Ministri.* By reading the Acts of the Synod of *Dort*, I find that, Session 144. notice was given that it was the will of the States, that the Belgick Confession of Faith should be read and examined by the Synod,

the *Exteri* being also present. Upon the reading of this 31 Article, that asserts the parity of Ministers, the Bishop of *Landaff* in his Name, and the Name of his Brethren, made open Protestation, *That whereas in the Confession there was inserted a strange Conceit of the parity of Ministers to be instituted by Christ*, he declared his own and his Brethrens utter dissent in that point. No dislike was shewn to this Article, asserting the parity of Ministers, by the Deputies of any other Reformed Church besides the English, by which we may judge what their Sentiments were in this point. So that the Reformed Churches do neither need Bishops, nor desire them, for they make all Ministers equal.

C H A P. V.

*Our Ordination better then that of Rome, (which is accounted valid in the Church of England) because in Roman Ordinations;*

- 1. Their Ordainers are incapable, as wanting Scriptural and Canonical Qualifications. 2. The manner of Ordaining grossly Superstitions and Unscriptural.*
- 3. The Ordained not Elected by the People. Sworn to the Pope.*
- 4. Their Office Idolatrous. Their Ordinations are by Bishops, ours without, answered.*

**T**HAT Ordination which is bet- Arg.IV.  
ter then that of the Church of  
*Rome* is valid, but Ordination by meer  
Presbyters is much better then that of  
the Church of *Rome*, Therefore 'tis va-  
lid. The Major will not be denied by

## A P L E A for

the Church of *England*, because she owns the Ordination of the Church of *Rome*, and doth not re-ordain their Priests — The Minor I prove, Ordination by Presbyters is better then the Ordinations of *Rome*, because in the Church of *Rome*,

I. The Ordainers are incapable, and that upon these Accounts :

(1.) They have not Scriptural Qualifications: *Paul's Bishop must be sound in the Faith* \*. Popish ordaining Bishops are studious Maintainers of corrupt Doctrine, and Enemies to the Faith, as is acknowledg'd by all Orthodox Protestants. *Paul's Bishop must be apt*

<sup>¶ 1 Tim 3. to teach ||.</sup> Popish Bishops are for the most part illiterate unpreaching Prelates, and justified herein by their own

<sup>4. 2.</sup> <sup>† Rhem. Annot. in 1 Tim. 1.</sup> Writers †. *Paul's Bishop must be blameless, the husband of one wife* \*.

<sup>7.</sup> <sup>\* 1 Tim. 3. 2.</sup> Popish Bishops forbid to marry, and yet allow Fornication ||. *Paul's Bishop must be a lover of good men* †.

<sup>¶ Vid. E- manuel's a Aphor. E- p. 20.</sup> Popish Prelates are not such, for they mortally hate the sincere Professors of the Gospel, and are

<sup>† Tit. 1. 8.</sup> all sworn to contribute their Endeavours for their Extirpation, under the Notion

of Hereticks. The words of the Oath  
are these ; *Hæreticos, Schismaticos, &*  
*Rebelles eidem Domino nostro [Papæ] vel*  
*Successoribus prædictis pro posse perse-*  
*quar & impugnabo \** : i. e. I A. B. do \* Vid. Pon.  
swear that *I will to the utmost of my en-* tif. de Co.  
*deavour prosecute and destroy all Here-* sec. Elect.  
*ticks, Schismatics, and all other Oppo-* in Episc.  
*sers of our Sovereign Lord the Pope, and*  
*his Successors.*

Shall the sworn Enemies of the Reformation be received as Ministers of Christ, and the Ministers of the Reformation be rejected as no Ministers? Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon, lest the uncircumcised triumph. But I proceed. A Bishop indeed must be a Pattern of Humility and Self-denial to the Flock †. Romish Bishops † Matth.  
are Lords over God's Heritage, have Do- 20, 25, 26.  
minion over their Faith, and bind them 1 Pet. 5. 3.  
to blind Obedience.

Now if the Ordinations of such usurping Monsters as these, that have nothing but the empty name of Bishops, be valid, as the Church of England faith they are ; how much more are the Ordinations of Orthodox faithful Gospel Ministers or Bishops, to be judg'd law-

ful? Can any thing be more absurd then that the Ministers of Antichrist, should make true Ministers, and the Ministers of Christ make false Prophets by one and the same Ordaining Act. It's the received Doctrine of the Church of *England* that the Pope is Antichrist. See Homily against Idolatry , part 3. p. 69. and the sixth part of the Sermon against Rebellion, p. 316.

(2.) They derive their Power from the Pope, who hath no right to the Universal Headship, either from Scripture or true Antiquity. The very Office of a Pope is contrary to the Prerogative and Laws of Christ, and consequently is a most Treasonable Usurpation.

## II.

\* Pontifi-  
cal. Rom.

II. The manner of their Ordaining is Unscriptural and Superstitious\*. They ascend to the Priesthood by several Steps or Degrees, which have no footsteps in the Sacred Writings. They make them

(1.) *Ostiarij*, or Door-keepers, whose Office is to ring the Bell, to open the Church-Vestry, and the Priest's Book. *Espenæus* † a Popish Writer, sheweth out of *Chrysostom* that it belong'd to the Office of a Deacon, to admit into the Church, and shut out. Then

† Esp. in  
3 Tim.  
p. 226. g.

Then (2.) they make them *Lectores*, Readers, whose work is to read and sing the Lessons, and to bless the Bread and all the first Fruits. In the primitive Church this was not a distinct Office, for in some places twas the Office of a Deacon, in some, of the Minister, and in some, it belogged to the Bishops to read the Scriptures, especially on Festivals.

(3.) The next step is that of *Exorcists*, whose pretended Office is to cast out Devils, in a feigned imitation of the miraculous Operations of the first Ages of Christianity. These *Sacred Conjurers*, who take upon them to dispossess Devils, are inferiour to the very Deacons that serve Tables, and yet equal to the very Apostles, were they able to perform what they undertake. Though one would wonder, why the Bishops, the pretended Successors of the Apostles, did not reserve to themselves the power of casting out unclean Spirits, as well as that of conferring the H.Spirit, which, as they say, none but themselves can do. But these *Exorcists* are Men of that extraordinary power, that they out-do the very Apostles, for they did not cast out Devils by laying on of Hands, as these pretend to do.

The

\*Pontif. de  
ord. Ex-  
orc.

The Bishop tells them that they are *Spirituales Imperatores ad abjiciendos Daemones de Corporibus obseffis*\* — i. e. they are Spiritual Governours to cast out Devils, &c. to which purpose he gives them power of laying Hands *super Energumenos frive Baptizatos frue Catechumenos* . . . .

† Pontif. de  
ord. A-  
colyth.

(4.) The next degree is that of the *Acolyti* †, whose Office is to be Taper-bearers, to light Candles, to bring Wine and Water for the Eucharist. They who were *Spiritual Emperours* a little before to conquer Devils, are now degraded, (which yet must be called an advancement) to the mean occupation of under-Servitors. The badge of their Office is a *Candlestick* and a *Pot*, which are delivered to them by the Bishop. As he delivers the Candlestick, he saith, *Accipite cero-ferarium, & sciatis vos ad accendenda Ecclesiae lumina mancipari*. . . . And as he delivers the Pot, he saith, *Accipite urceolum ad suggerendum vinum & aquam in Eucharistiam Sanguinis Christi* . . . .

|| Pontif. de  
ord. Subd.

(5.) They climb after this to the degree of *Sub-deacons* ||, whose business is to prepare Water for the Ministry of the

the Altar, to Minister to the Deacons, to wash the Palls of the Corporals, to present the Cup and Paten for the use of their abominable Sacrifice. The Bishop puts a Garment upon their Heads to signify the Castigation of the Speech, and then puts the *Manipulus* upon their left Arm, to signify Good Works, *ib.* After this he cloaths them with a Coat, to signify Joy and Gladness, *ibid.* Last of all, he delivers to them the Book of Epistles to be read for the Living and the Dead, *ibid.* The Sub-deacons of \* *Ephes.* in old were but Letter-Carriers to the Bi- Tim. p. 214.2. shops \*.

(6.) Then they make them *Deacons* †, † *Ib. de Ord. Disc.* whose Office is to Minister at the Altar, to Baptize and Preach, after the example of *Stephen*, as is pretended. The Bishop pretends to give them the Holy Ghost, cloaths them in significant white Garments, and delivers to them the Book of the Gospels, saying, *Accipe potestatem* — i. e. *Take power to read the Gospel in the Church both for the living and the dead.*

(7.) From Deacons || they ascend to || *Pontif. de Ord. Presb.* the Order of Priesthood. The Form of making them is very ridiculous : scarce

scarce any footsteps of the Apostolical Practice to be found in it.

The Person to be Ordained presents himself to the Bishop with a multitude of superstitious Rags, such as the *Alb*, *Cingulum*, *Stola*, the *Manipulus*, the *Planaeta*, &c. holding a Candle in his right hand, to signify he must be a shining Light to the People. Then the Bishop binds the *Stole* about his neck, to put him in mind of the Yoke of Christ, *ib.* After this the *Capsula* being folded, is put over his Shoulders to denote Charity, then the Bishop unfolds it again, and cloaths the Priest with it, to signify Innocence, *ib.* The same white Garment signifies Charity when 'tis folded up, and Innocency when 'tis unfolded. You must not ask the reason of this different signification, for profound Mysteries are wrapt up in all the foldings of this sacred Garment, which is apt to stir up the dull mind of Man to the remembrance of his duty.

When they have adorn'd them in this beggarly Garment, and made them look partly like those Priests that serv'd the old Tabernacle, and partly like those that ministred at Heathen Altars, they anoint

anoint their Hands with Oyl, greasing them with the sign of the Cross, and adding these words, *Consecrentur . . . istæ manus . . . ut quæcunque benedixerint, benedicantur.* The Bishop also shaves their Heads, saying, *Dominus pars hæreditatis meæ \**, &c. Their Learned Authors tell us of unaccountable Mysteries that are contained in this Pagan Ceremony. *Lombard* saith, the shaven Crown signifies Kingly Dignity †; *Crona regale decus significat.* The signification is not very improper, for they lord it over God's Heritage, and exalt themselves above Kings and Princes. The same Author adds, That *Denudatio Capitis est revelatio mentis; Clericus enim secretorum Dei non ignarus esse debet . . .* And no wonder their shaving Priests are such great Clerks, since shaving the Pate is the mysterious Path to Knowledge. He tells us also, *ob vitæ continentiam caput radebant*, ibid. They shav'd themselves for Chastity's sake. The unclean Stories of Monkish Lives are convincing Evidences of their Mortification.

\* Lib. contra Parmen. Optatus \* reproveth the *Donatists* for their symbolizing with the silly Custom of the Heathen, in shaving the Heads of their Priests. *Docete ubi vobis mandatum est, capita Sacerdotum radere ... cum & contra sint tot Exempla proposita fieri non debere.* This Ceremony is of an Heathen Original, as appears by Mi-

† De Idol. *nutius Fælix* †, with whom agrees the van. p. 61. Council of *Eliberis* ||, who excommunicated such as did so, and after the expiration of two years received them into Communion, upon supposition they continued in the Faith.

The Council of *Trent* Anathematizes any that will reject or speak against these foolish fopperies \*.

\* Sess. 23.  
de fac. ord.  
Can. 5.

How different is this Form of Ordination from the Scripture-Ordinations? Ministers in the Apostles times were Ordained by Fasting and Prayer, with imposition of Hands, without any other Ceremonies that we read of. Let the World judge, whether our Ordinations, which follow the Scripture Pattern, or the Romish Ordinations, which are a mere Pageantry, are the better; and if theirs be admitted as valid, why should ours be condemned?

Shall

Shall they who pass under such unscriptural Forms and Shapes of *Door-keepers, Readers, Exorcists, &c.* be accounted Ministers of Christ, and must those who vary not from the Scriptures in their Ordinations, be reckon'd Intruders? Can any of the sincere Patrons of the Protestant Interest pass such a partial unjust Censure? Are they true Ministers, who recede from the Apostles practice as far as the East is from the West, and must those be none who make it their Rule? Shall those Ordinations which are Humane and Antichristian (and therefore laid aside in the Church of *England*) be received, and theirs which are Divine and Apostolical be rejected? The thing is so very clear to such as are not wilfully blinded with Prejudice and Interest, that one may justly wonder how it should ever come into debate.

III. Our Ordinations are better then the Ordinations of *Rome*, if we consider the Persons ordained. That which we have said concerning the want of Qualifications in the Ordainers, may be also applied to the ordained in the Roman Communion. Their Priests are made

Bellar.de  
Cler.lib.1.  
cap.7 & 8.

Vid.Cypr.  
Ep. 68.  
Eusib.VI.  
10.

made without the Election of the People ; and Bellarmine saith that neither their *Suffragium*, *Concilium*, or *Consensus* is required, which is contrary to Scripture, and Antiquity, as our Protestant Writers have proved against the Papists. See Willet's *Synops. Papismi*, 5 *Controvers. Quest. 2. p. 260.* ..

All the Popish Priests are sworn to observe the Decrees of the Council of Trent, whereby their Consciences are captivated to all the Idolatries, Superstitions, and Errours of the Church of Rome ; they take also an Oath of Canonical Obedience to their Bishops, which makes them more the Servants of Men, then of Crist, [Cor. 7.2] Gal. 1. 10. This Oath is forbidden by an old Council at Chalons ; *Dicitum est interea de quibusdam fratribus, quod eos quos ordinaturi sunt, jurare cogantur, quod contra Canones non sint facturi, & obedientes sint Episcopo qui eos ordinat, & Ecclesiae in qua ordinantur. Quod iuramentum quia periculose est, omnes una inhibendum statuimus.*

Conc.Ca-  
billon.  
Can.13.

The Romish Bishops about the Eleventh Century, obliged all the Bishops at their Examinations to promise Subjection

jection and Fealty in all things to St. Peter, and to his Church, to his Vicar, and to his Successors, as appears by the *Roman Order*, which in all likely-hood was writ about that time, and where is to be seen amongst the Questions made to the Bishop which was examined, those which regard Obedience and Fidelity. The form of the Oath may be seen in the *Roman Pontifical*.

Tom. 10.  
Probl. Part.  
p. 107.

Dr. Willet makes the Oath of Obedience to the Pope a mark of Antichrist. Controv. 4.  
q. 10. p.  
233, 234.  
If it be bad in the Pope, the chief Bishop, to require such an Oath, it cannot be good in inferior Bishops, unless they were more infallible than the Head of their Succession.

The first Instance that I can find of an Oath required by Ecclesiastical Guides to bind Persons to their Communion, is that of *Novatus* the Heretick, who swore all his Communicants not to return to *Cornelius*. Ecccl. Hist.  
lib. 6. c. 43. *Vide Epist. Cornel. ad Fabium Antioch. præfitem, in Euseb.* This is much of the same nature with the Oath *De jure pariendo*, administered in Ecclesiastical Courts to Excommunicated Persons at their Reconciliation.

G In

In short, our Ordinations are better then Popish Ordinations, because our Candidates are admitted upon sufficient trial of their Qualifications, are not obtruded upon the People without their choice and consent, and nothing is required of them but Obedience to the Laws of Christ; all which are otherwise in the Ordinations of *Rome*.

## IV.

IV. Ours are better then Popish Ordinations, if we consider the Office to which they are Ordained, which is one of the grossest pieces of Idolatry that ever was in the World, viz. the offering up of their Bread-Idol, under the Notion of a Propitiatory Sacrifice for the Living and the Dead. *Forma Sacerdotii hæc est* ( saith *Hunnæus*) *Accipe potestatem offerendi Sacrificium in Ecclesiâ pro Vivis & Mortuis, in Nomine Patrii, & Filii, & Spiritus Sancti.* The words of Consecration in the *Roman Pontifical* are with this Addition; *Accipe potestatem offere Sacrificium Deo, Missâsque celebrare.* They make the very Essence Lib. 4. dist. of the Priestly Office to consist in potestate placabiles Deo hostias offerendi, as 24. J. the Master of the Sentences speaks. The

*Aug. Hunn.  
de Sacr.  
Ordin.  
Axiom. 65*

*Pontific.  
Rom. de  
Ord. Pres.*

*Coun-*

Council of Trent makes Preaching of the Word, which is the first thing in the Apostles Commission, to be a separable Accident. *Si quis dixerit, non esse in Novo Testamento Sacerdotium visibile, & externum, vel non esse potestatem aliquam consecrandi & offerendi verum Corpus & Sanguinem Domini; & peccata remittendi & retinendi; sed officium tantum, & nudum ministerium praedicandi Evangelium, VEL EOS QUI NON PRÆDICANT, PRORSUS NON ESSE SACERDOTES, anathema fit.*

For these Reasons the Reformed Churches of France did not admit Popish Priests, that had forsaken the Roman Communion, into the Ministry, without long and diligent Inspection and Examination, they must be approved of at least for two years from the time of their Conversion: nor were they then suffered to exercise as Ministers, until they submitted to another Ordination; and they were not to receive Imposition of Hands any more then if they were Strangers, without the advice of Provincial and National Synods.

Fr. Discipl.  
cap. I. art.  
2 & 3.

Vide Bez.  
contra Sa-  
tav.

*A PLEA for*

Now these Idolatrous Shavelings, whose Ordainers are the Pope's Creatures, whose Ordination is the product of a prophane Invention, and whose work is to make a Wafer-God : I say, these are taken for true Ministers in the Church of *England*, though it be as hard to find the Essentials of the Ministry among them, as to find a Pearl in a Dunghill. Therefore the Ordination of Presbyters, now in question, should be admitted for valid, as being more agreeable to the Scriptures in all the respects mentioned, and not to be justly charged with any defect in things essential to the Ministry.

*Object.* *Object.* Popish Ordinations are done by Diocesan Bishops, which you have not, therefore your Ordinations are null.

*Answ.* This Objection hath been answered already. It supposeth three things which are notoriously false. The first is, That the sole Power of Ordination was in the Apostles. 2. That they had Successors in the Apostolical Office ; both which we have disproved. And 3dly, it supposeth Popish Bishops to be the Apostles Successors , which

found

sounds harsh in Protestant Ears: Can they be the Apostles Successors, who have not the Apostolical Doctrine? when they urge this Succession against the first Reformers, and quote the Fathers, *Tertullian, Irenæus, &c.* who argue from this Topick against the old Hereticks, they are answered by our Protestants Writers, that the Ancients spoke not *de solâ Episcoporum successione*, <sup>Saint de</sup> <sup>voc. Mini-</sup> <sup>str. p. 545.</sup> *sed de Doctrinæ successione, ac ejus fidei, quam primi Episcopi ab Apostolis acceptam atque hanciam ad posteros continuâ serie transfuderunt.* To the same purpose speak our *Jewel, Whittaker, Reynolds, Willet, &c.*

If either of these three Points fail, this Objection is impertinent, how much more when all the three are precarious. Our Ordinations are in all things confessedly good, except the concurrence of a Diocesan Bishop; the Popish Ordinations have nothing to recommend them but the defiled hand of a nominal Bishop, so that the bare touch of his hand imprints an indelible Character, where the Spirit of Christ hath left no impressions of his Image. This is to ascribe greater virtue to the Fingers of

a Prelate in making Ministers, then to the Spirit of God. Let a Person Ordained by Presbyters be never so well qualified, be never so faithful in the discharge of his Office; let another Person that is Ordained by a Bishop, be never so defective in Qualifications, suppose a Reading Curate that cannot preach, let him be never so prophanè in his Life, yet this Man must pass for a true Minister, because he had the ineffectual Blessing of a Bishop, and the other a meer Ulurper, and all his Administrations must be null and void, for want of this Ceremony. Let the Spirit of God indue a Man with never such excellent Gifts for the Ministry, it shall be in the power of a Prelate to exclude him, that he shall be no Minister of Christ, though he devote himself to the Work, and be solemnly set apart for it: nay more, it will be in his power to make a Minister of another Person, whom the Holy Ghost never designed for that Office, by any real work of Sanctification upon his heart, or conferring upon him any tolerable degree of Ministerial Abilities. They that can believe such Fancies may please themselves

selves therewith, Christ gave us another Rule to discern between false and true Pastors, *Matth. 7.15,16—20.* *Ye shall know them by their fruits;* that is, by their *Doctrine and Conversation.* The Reformers vindicate their Ministry against the Papists by this Argument: *Christus hanc nobis regulam præfinitiverit, quâ possimus falsos à veris Doctoribus discernere,* <sup>Sed. ubi supra, p.</sup> *nempe eos à suis fructibus esse dignoscendos, cur eâ non contenti, alias præterea temere, & pro arbitrio configamus? Itaque judicetur tum de pontificiis, tum etiam de nostris Pastoribus, ex Doctrinâ quæ verus est fructus, atque etiam, si placet, utrorumque vita in disquisitionem vocetur. Quod si fiat, certò speramus, Deo favente, nos facilè in hac causâ fore superiores.* We are very willing to put our Case to the same Issue, to be judged according to this Rule of Christ, by our Doctrine and Conversation.

## C H A P. VI.

*Presbyters Power of Ordination  
prov'd from their Imposition of  
Hands in Ordination, not as  
bare Approvers. Turrianus,  
Heylin, J. Taylor, &c. confu-  
ted. Two other Objections an-  
swered.*

Arg. V. **T**Hose that have power to impose Hands in Ordination have power to Ordain, but Presbyters have power to impose Hands in Ordination, therefore to Ordain.

The *Minor*, viz. that Presbyters may impose Hands, will not be denied.

'Tis required by the Old Canons\* — *Omnis*

*Presbyteri qui præsentes sunt manus*

*suas juxta manum Episcopi super ca-*

*put illius + teneant.* *Chrysostom* was

*Ordinan*-charged in a Libel put in by *Isaacius*

*di Presby-* (how justly is not certain) that he Or-

*ained Ministers without the Concur-*

*rence of his Presbyters:* "On

\* Conc.

Carth. 4.

Can. 3.

Vid. Can.

Presb. dist.

23.

*di Presby-*

*upi.*

edels

ιδεται παρεγγομεν την κληρον ποιησεν  
χειροτονias. Phot. Biblioth. v. p. 27. Ed.  
dit. Aug. Vindelic. 1601. However, the  
Presbyters continued to lay Hands with  
the Bishops, even in the darkest Ages  
of the Church, as might be proved by  
several Instances if necessity required.  
But this is so undeniable, that to this  
day the Presbyters are admitted to joyn  
with the Bishop in imposition of Hands,  
in the Church of *England*. And in the  
present Church of *Rome* also, all the  
Presbyters that are present are required  
to lay Hands with the Bishop.\*

\* Pontif. de  
Ord. Presb.

The *Major* will be deny'd (that  
though they impose Hands they have  
not the Ordaining Power) I thus prove  
it; That which is an Ordaining Act  
befpeaks an Ordaining Power; but im-  
position of Hands in Ordination is an  
Ordaining Act, therefore . . . The *Major* is  
evident, for *Actus presupponit potentiam*.  
As to the *Minor*, If imposing of Hands  
in Ordination be not *Actus ordinans*,  
what is it? I should be glad to see one  
Instance given in the Apostles times of  
Persons laying on Hands in Ordination,  
that had no Ordaining Power.

If

## A PLEA for

If imposition of Hands in Ordination be no evidence of an Ordaining Power, how come the Bishops to urge that Scripture (*1 Tim. 5.22. Lay bands suddenly on no man*) in favour of Timothy's Ordaining Power, and thence to infer he was Bishop of *Ephesus* ? Timothy might lay Hands for Ordination , and yet have no Ordaining Power, and so be no Bishop of *Ephesus*. Thus they unwarily undermine their own Foundations.

It's a meer *Subterfuge*, and indeed such as betrays the Caufe, to acknowledge that Presbyters may perform all the outward Acts of Ordination , but not as Ordainers. 'Tis as if one should say, a Presbyter hath Power to apply Water to a Child in Baptism in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, but he hath no power to Baptize. He may set apart Bread and Wine, and distribute it to the People according to Christ's Institution ; but he hath no power to Administer the Lord's Supper.

If Presbyters imposing of Hands signify no Ordaining Power , what doth it signify ? *Turrianus* the Jesuit saith it

sig.

signifies their Approbation of the Bishops *act non Excludantur Presbyteri ab impositione manus approbante, sed ab ordinante.* He is followed herein by many of our own. Dr. Heylin \* saith, <sup>† Heyl.</sup> *The Presbyters Hands confer nothing of* <sup>Hist. of Ep. p. 162.</sup> *the power of Order upon the Party ordained, but only testify their consent unto the busines, and approbation of the man.* To the same purpose speaks Dr. J. Taylor †. But that cannot be the <sup>Vide his Episc. asserted.</sup> meaning of it; for they could signify their approbation some other way, without imposition of Hands; their saying *Amen* to the Ordination Prayer would be a sufficient expression of their Consent. The Peoples approbation was required in primitive Ordinations ||; who || *Cypr. Ep.* never were admitted to lay Hands with <sup>68.</sup> the Bishop. The Consent of the People was required in the Ordination of Deacons \*; yet did they not lay Hands <sup>\* Act. 6.3.</sup> on them †. If no more be intended by it, then a bare approbation, how come the Bishops alone to lay Hands upon Deacons without their Presbyters. *Hic cum ordinantur solus Episcopus eis manum imponit ||.* But this signification is deserted by a Learned Bishop, who saith, <sup>|| Pontif. de Ord. Diac.</sup>

## A PLEA for

*I think rather they dedicate him to God for the Ministry, which is conferred on him by the Bishop.* This specious Evasion is equally disserviceable to the present Point, with the former. Where in all the *New Testament* have we any ground for this distinction? How can it be said that the Ministry is conferred by the Bishop first, and afterwards the Presbyters dedicate the Person to God, when both Bishops and Presbyters do lay Hands together; Can he be ordained and dedicated to God as two distinct Acts, the one inferiour to the other, and that in the same moment of time, by the same Ceremony of Imposition of Hands, and by the same words?

How comes the Bishops Hand to confer the Ministry more then the Presbyters? not by any inherent virtue in the one more then in the other; not from any Institution of Christ or his Apostles, appropriating an Ordaining, or Minister-making Power to the Bishops Hand, and a bare dedication to the Ministry actually conferred, to the Presbyters Hands.

The Scriptures of the *New Testament* make no mention of such distinct significations of that Ceremony, and therefore they cannot be *ex instituto*; and it's plain they are not *ex natura rei*. Might not the Presbyters dedicate the Person to God without the laying on of Hands? Can there be no dedication to God without laying Hands on the Persons so dedicated? The whole Church dedicates him to God by Prayer, and yet don't lay on Hands, so that meer dedication to God in the Learned Bishop's sense as distinct from Ordination, cannot be the meaning of this Ceremony.

But, I pray, what is Ordination itself but a dedication of the Person to God for the Ministry? what more doth the Bishop do in conferring the Ministry? He cannot confer it by a meer Physical Contact, if so, every touch of his Hand on the Head of a Man, Woman, or Child would make them Ministers. It must be therefore by a Moral Act that he doth it, i.e. by laying on Hands on a fit Person according to the appointment of God, to dedicate him to God for the Ministry.

The

## A P L E A for

The power is immediately from Christ and not from the Bishop: Men do but open the door, or determine the Person that from Christ shall receive the power, and then put him solemnly into possession, *Act 20.28.* The moderate asserters of Episcopacy do acknowledge that the Presbyters lay on Hands as Ordainers:

*\*So Forbes in his Iren. l.2.c.11. p.163.* *Imponunt manus Presbyteri... tanquam Ordinantes, seu ordinem Conferentes, & ex potestate ordinandi divinitus accepta gratiam ordinato, hoc adhibito ritu,apprecantes.* With whom agrees *†Spalat.de Rep. Eccl. II.2.p.187.* the Arch-bishop of Spalato f. Dr. Fulk *¶Fulk in Tit. I. §. 2.* speaks to the same purpose in his *Rhemish Annotations ||.*

*Object.* Where do you read that Presbyters did ordain without a Bishop?

*Answ.* This Objection grants my Argument, that Presbyters have power of Ordination, but not to be put forth without the Bishop. Admit they have an inherent Power, and it's all I plead for; I am sure no Law of God restrains the Exercise of it, while it is managed regularly for the Edification of the Church. We oppose not any Rules of Order, while the main End is promoted.

The

The old Canons restrain the Bishop, that he must not Ordain without his Presbyters \*; we may say as well then, <sup>\* Conc.</sup>  
<sup>Carth. 4.</sup> <sup>c. 22.</sup> that Bishops have no power to Ordain, because they were not ordinarily to do it without their Presbyters.

All the Ordinations of Presbyters in the Apostles time, and in the three first Centuries were done by Presbyters without Bishops of the present Species, i. e. the sole Governours of 100 or 200 Churches, for there were no such Bishops in the Primitive Church, as hath been proved by several hands †. The very <sup>† Dr. Owen,</sup> Office is humane and new. The primitive <sup>Mr. Baxter,</sup> Bishop was but the chief Presbyter, <sup>Mr. Clark-</sup> son. who was President for orders sake, but pretended not to be of a superior Order.

Bishop Usher answered this Objection from the Example of the Church of Alexandria (as Mr. B. affirms) which shall be consider'd anon, when we come to Instances of Ordaining Presbyters in Antiquity.

## C H A P. VII.

*Among the Jews any one that was Ordained himself might Ordain another, prov'd from Dr. Lightfoot, Mr. Selden, P. Cuneus.*

Arg.VI. **I**F among the Jews any one that was Ordain'd himself might Ordain another, then may Presbyters Ordain Presbyters. But the former is true---- Therefore, &c.

The Consequence of the *Major* is founded upon that which is acknowledg'd by most Learned Men, that the Government of the Christian Church was formed after the Jewish Pattern.

*Lightfoot Harm. Vol. 1.p.612.* The *Minor* I prove from Dr. Lightfoot : Thus he ; Before they had restrained themselves of their own Liberties, then the general Rule for Ordinations among them was, **כל כי ינו**, every one regularly Ordained himself, had the power of Ordaining his Disciples, as Ben Maimon affirms. Mr.Selden gives many

ny Instances to this purpose out of *Ge  
mar. Babylon. de Synedr. lib. 2. c. 7. §. 1.*  
But in the time of *Hillel* they were  
restrain'd from their former Liberty;  
whether out of Veneration to his House,  
or whether from the inconveniency of  
such common Ordinations, is not cer-  
tain; and so it was resolved that none  
might Ordain without the presence of  
the Prince of the *Sanhedrin*, or a Li-  
cense from him.

*Per insigne est*, saith *P. Cunæus*, quod cuna. de  
R. Maimonides tradidit in Salach. San-  
hed. c. 4. Cum enim olim solennem hunc  
actum pro arbitrio suo omnes celebrarent,  
quibus imposita semel manus fuerat, co-  
arctatum esse id jus à sapientibus, consti-  
tutumque ut deinceps nemo illud usurpa-  
ret, nisi cui id concessisset divinus senex  
R. Hillel.

*Selden*, saith that *St. Paul's* creating De Synedr.  
of Presbyters was according to the <sup>c. 14</sup> Custom of creating Elders, *Paul* be-  
ing brought up at the feet of *Gamaliel*,  
as his Disciple. This *Gamaliel* was  
Nephew, or Grandchild of *Hillel*, and  
Prince of the *Sanhedrin* at that time,  
and therefore no doubt but he had  
created his Scholar *Paul*, a Jewish El-  
der,

der, before he was a Christian ; by virtue of which Ordination in all likelihood the Jews admitted him to preach in their Synagogues, *Acts 9. 20.*

Now when *Paul* became an Apostle, he knew himself and other Apostles to be free from the new Law, of not making Elders without the licence of the Prince of the *Sanhedrin*, which was not to be expected in their Case ; for this *R. Gamaliel*, though otherwise a fair Man, had an inveterate prejudice against the Christians, and authorized a Prayer against them, under the notion of Hereticks, commanding its constant use in the Synagogues, as \* *Lightfoot* observes out of *Maimonides* ; which Prayer is used among the Jews to this day, containing bitter Curses and Execrations against the Christians, as *Buxtorf* notes.

\* Vol. I.  
p. 278.

Synag. Ju-  
daic.c. 5.

Hamm.  
Quer.  
P. 349.

Dr. *Hammond* himself granteth that the Government of the Church was formed after the Jewish manner, though he reckoneth up many Inconveniences which would follow promiscuous Ordinations.

The

The Analogy between the Government of the Jewish Synagogues and the Christian Church seems very evident in the Case of Deacons, who succeed the Jewish פָרָסִין *Parasim*, of which there were two or three in every Synagogue to take care of the Poor. *Vide Lightf. Harm. on Act. 6. & 7.*

To sum up this Argument, the Case of Presbyters in point of Ordination, is the same with that of Jewish בְּנֵי־זֶבַח or Elders. Every one that was Ordained himself had originally the Power of Ordaining others, the Exercise of which Power was afterwards restrained by a Canon of that Church: So in the Christian Church, at first in Scripture times, Presbyters had a common power of Ordination; but afterwards *ut schismatum semina evellerentur*, the power was by degrees devolved upon a few chief Presbyters, whom we call Bishops, and the ordinary Presbyters were restrained by common consent, as *Jerom observes in Tit. I. Hier. in Tit. I.* and \* *Panormitan* after him.

\**Decr. I. 24*

*A PLEA for*

How well the new Order of superiour Bishops hath cured the World of Schism, the Distractions and Confusions of the Church , occasioned by the Pride and Grandeur of that Order, for above a thousand years together, are Instances to palpable to be deny'd.

C H A P.

---

## C H A P. VIII.

*Ordination an Act of the Exercise  
of the Power of the Keys, ac-  
knowledged by Cornelius à La-  
pide, Chamier, Camero, &c.  
The Keys of Jurisdiction and  
Order given to Presbyters, and  
consequently Power of Ordina-  
tion.*

**T**HAT Ordination which is performed by Persons who have the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven committed to them, is valid; but Ordination by Presbyters is performed by Persons who have the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven committed to them, Therefore it is valid.

The *Major* I prove: Either Ordination is an Act of the Exercise of the Power of the Keys, or of some other Power, but of no other; If any other, it's either of a Secular Power, or of an

Ecclesiastical; but neither of these : Not an Ecclesiastical, for there is no Ecclesiastical Power, ( at least , which Ordination can be pretended to belong to) but the Power of the Keys ; not of a Secular Power , for that belongs not to Ministers.

That the Keys do contain in them the Power of Ordination is acknowledged by Papists and Protestants, particularly by *Cornelius à Lapide, Chemnitius, Bucer, Chamier.* *Nomine clavium significatur omnis potestas Ecclesiastica,* Suppl. Cham. lib. 4. c. 4.

*Traditio Clavium, saith Camero, Symbolum est potestatis atque auctoritatis collatæ, Isa. 22. 22. Rev. 3. 7. Clavium traditione Doctorum apud Iudeos inauguracione veteri instituto peragebatur.* The Keys delivered to the Jewish Teachers included the power of Ordination; for, as we observed before, Every one, regularly Ordained himself, had the power of Ordaining his Disciples, Maimon.

The Minor is in part granted by all, to wit, That Presbyters have the Key of Doctrine; that they have the Key of Jurisdiction and Order also, as some

disting.

distinguish them, I thus prove; They that have the Key of Doctrine have also the Key of Jurisdiction and Order; but Presbyters have the former, therefore they have the latter.

The Major I thus prove; Christ gave the Keys together, and did not divide them, therefore they that have the Key of Doctrine have the Key of Jurisdiction and Order. *To thee I give the Keys,* saith our Lord, Matth. 16. 19. Jo. 20. 23. He did not give one Key to one, and both to another; he gives no single Key to any Person, but Keys, and to whatever these Keys serve for. We know no distribution of the Keys, but what is grounded upon Scripture.

He that hath the Keys of a House or Castle delivered to him, hath power to admit or exclude Persons, as he seeth cause. Except there be a Limitation in his Order or Commission, his power extends to all Persons without exception. Christ here doth not limit the power of the Keys; therefore if Presbyters may admit Church-Members into the House of God by Baptism, they may admit Church-Officers by Ordination.

## C H A P. IX.

All that have the Power of Order may confer it; acknowledged by Arch-Bishop Usher and Dr. Fern. Bishops and Presbyters have the Power of Order equally. Proved, 1. By the Ancient Fathers. 2. By Schoolmen, Lombard, Bonaventure, &c. 3. By the Canonists, Gratian, Joh. Semeca, &c. 4. By Councils, as that of Aquilgratum, Hispalis, Constance, Basil. Bishops not expressly determined a superior Order in the Council of Trent. 5. This is acknowledged by the Old Church of England, in the Canons of Elfrick, and by J. Wicklef, Lambert the Martyr, the Provincial

vincial Synod of 1537. Cranmer, Juel, Morton, Bilson, &c. This Truth is owned by the now Bishop of Salisbury, and by the Bishop of Worcester. Ordination by Presbyters allowed in the Old Church of England. Instances of it.

Orders conferred by such as are in Arg. VIII. Orders, and have the power of Order equal with the highest Bishop, are valid; but Orders conferred by Presbyters, are conferred by such as are in Orders, and have the power of Order equally with the highest Bishop, Therefore Orders conferred by Presbyters are valid.

As to the Major, it's founded on that Maxim frequently used by Arch-Bishop Usher, *Ordinis est conferre Ordines*, a Man that is in Orders, *quoad Presbyteratum*, may *aeteris paribus* confer Orders, it being like Generation, or Univocal Causation. This Maxim is acknowledged by Dr. H. Fern\*, in his\* <sup>Comp.</sup> *Compendious Discourse*, p. 115, 116, 117. <sup>Difc. p.</sup> If 115—

If among the Papists Men of an inferior Order do make the Pope, and among our selves Bishops do make Arch-Bishops ; how much more may Men of the same Order give what they have, that is, *Ordinem Sacerdotii*, as the School-men call it. Why may not Presbyters make Presbyters, as Physicians make Physicians ? All Ranks or Orders of Beings generate their own kind, but the impotent Order of Presbyters must prove extinct, if the favourable Influences of a superior Order do not propagate it, by a sort of equivocal Generation. Must Presbyters be reckoned amongst those Monsters in Nature that cannot perpetuate themselves by Propagation ?

The *Minor*, That Bishops and Presbyters have the power of Order equally, will be acknowledged by most Protestants and Papists. The Scripture nowhere mentions any distinction of Order among ordinary Ministers. Neither do we read there but of one kind of Ordination ; then certainly there can be but one Order of Presbyters, or Gospel-Ministers, properly so called ; for two distinct Orders cannot be conferred

ferred in the same instant, by the same words, and by the same actions. Let a man shew me from Scripture, that *Timothy* or *Titus*, or any other were Ordained twice, made first Presbyters, then Bishops, which is absolutely necessary if they be distinct Characters. This Point of the Identity of Bishops and Presbyters hath the Consent of the Fathers, School-men, Canonists, Councils, and of the Old Church of England.

(1.) As to the Fathers, *Blondel* in his *Apology for Jerom's Opinion*, quotes most that are considerable, who unanimously affirm the Identity of Bishops and Presbyters. The Testimonies of *Clemens Romanus*, *Polycarp*, *Irenaeus*, *Clemens Alexandrin*. *Jerom*, *Austin*, *Hilarius*, *Isidore*, &c. may be seen at large in the said Learned Author. To which I could add several more, if it were needful.

(2. The Judgment of the Schoolmen is the same in this Point.

The Master of the Sentences faith, *Apud veteres iidem Episcopi & Presbyteri fuerunt*. He adds, *Excellenter Canones duos tantum sacros Ordines appellari*

Lib. 4. dist.  
24. J.

Sententia.

Historia.

lari censem, Diaconatus sc. & Presbyteratus, quia hos solos primitiva Ecclesia legitur habuisse, & de his solis præceptum Apostoli habemus.

Bonaventure, in 4 sent. dist. 24. q. 1. A. 1. Episcopatus deficit ab Ordine, &c. includit necessarium Ordinem perfectissimum, sc. Sacerdotium. With whom agree Durand. Dominic. Soto, Aureolus, &c. who all Comment upon Lombard's Text. See Aquinas's Suppl. quest. 37. Art. 2. Mr. Fran. Mason in his Defence of the Ordinations of Ministers beyond the Seas, hath more Quotations of Schoolmen.

(3.) To this Opinion some Canonists subscribe.

Dist. 6o.  
c. null ex  
verb. Papa. Gratian, Sacros Ordines dicimus Diaconatum & Presbyteratum, hos quidem solos Ecclesia primitiva habuisse dicuntur.

Johannes Semeca in his Gloss on the Canon Law. Dicunt quidem quod in Ecclesia prima primitiva, Commune erat Officium Episcoporum & Sacerdotum, & nomina erant Communia. Dist. 95. c. olim. Et Officium erat Commune, sed in secunda primitiva cœperunt distingui, & Nomina & Officia, &c. Gloss, in Dist.

95. c. Legimus, in verb. postea.

Arch-Bishop *Usher* appeals to this first primitive Church in Matters of Doctrine, and why may not we appeal to it in point of Discipline, as well as Doctrine?

De Succ. &  
Stat. Eccl.  
cap. i. p. 19.

See many more Canonists quoted in Mr. *Mason*, ubi supra, (4.) Some Councils also attest to this Truth.

The Council of *Aix le Chapelle* Conc. A-  
owns the Identity of Bishops and Pres- quisit. Can.  
byters; *Sed solum propter autoritatem,*  
*summo Sacerdoti Clericorum Ordinatio*  
*reservata est.*

To the same purpose speaks the Council of *Hispalis*, or *Sevil. Concil.*  
*Hispal. 2. Cas. 7.*

In the Councils of *Constance* and *Basil*, after long debate, it was concluded that Presbyters should have decisive Suffrages in Councils, as well as Bishops, because by the Law of God, Bishops were no more then Presbyters, and it's expressly given them, *Acts 15.*

23.

In the Council of *Trent*, all the Spa- Hist. of the  
niards, with some others, moved that Council of  
the superiority of Bishops *de jure Divi-* Trent, 1.7. p. 619.

no might be defined ; next morning came into the Legat's Chamber three Patriarchs, six Arch-Bishops, and eleven Bishops, with a Request that it might not be put into the Canon, that the Superiority is *de jure Divino*, because it favoured of Ambition, and it was not seemly themselves should give Sentence in their own Cause ; and besides, the greater part would not have it put in. At length the Opinion of the *Spaniards* prevailed , and was inserted into the Canon, though in such ambiguous words as might not offend the other Party. The words of the

*Conc. Trident.* *Canon are these ; Si quis dixerit, Episcopos non esse Presbyteris superiores, vel non habere potestatem confirmandi, & ordinandi, vel eam quam habent, illis esse cum Presbyteris Communem — anathema sit.* This Decision was made,

*Hist. of the C. of Trent.* 1. In opposition to the *Lutherans* : This Reason was given by the Arch Bishops *606, 607, of Granata* (in the Congregation held

*Ibid. p. 604, Octob. 13. 1562.*) and of *Zarab*, as also by the Bishop of *Segovia*. 2. In favour of the Pope, for they were afraid that if the Divine Institution and Superiority of Bishops were denied,

the

the Pope's triple Crown would soon fall off his Head. So the Bishop of Segovia; If the power of the Bishops be diminished, that of the Pope is weaken'd. To the same purpose said the Arch-Bishop of Granata, being assured that if the Bishops Authority were diminished, the Obedience to the Holy See would decrease also.

The very Council of *Trent* doth not expressly determine Bishops to be a Superior Order to Presbyters, and the general definition which they make of their Superiority above Presbyters, and of their sole power of Ordination and Confirmation, is in opposition to the Protestants, and in favour of the Pope. Which puts me in mind of a passage in the Council of *Constance*, where that blessed Man of God, Mr. John Wickleff was condemned for a Heretick, and his Error; Bones ordered to be taken up and burnt. in Conc. Wickleff. 28  
One of the Articles for which he was Condemned, was this, *Confirmatio juvenum, Clericorum Ordinatio, locorum consecratio reservantur Papæ & Episcopis propter cupiditatem lucri temporalis, & honoris.*

(5.) This

(5.) This Doctrine hath been main-tain'd also by the Church of *England*, both Popish and Protestant.

In Spelm.  
P. 576.

The Judgment of the Church of *England* in the times of Popery, we have in the Canons of *Elfrick ad Wulfin Episc.* where the Bishop is declared to be of the same Order with the Presbyter. *Hanc pluris interest inter Missalem Presbyterum & Episcopum, quam quod Episcopus constitutus sit ad Ordinationes conferendas, & ad visitandum seu inspicendum, curandumque ea quae ad Deum pertinent, quod nimiae crederetur multitudo, si omnis Presbyter hoc idem faceret. Ambo siquidem unum tenent eundem Ordinem, quamvis dignior sit illa pars Episcopi.*

The ancient Confessors and Martyrs here were of the same mind.

Catal. Test. Tom. 2. It is said of that eminent Confessor *John Wickleff*, that *tantum duos Ordines Ministrorum esse debere judicavit, viz. Presbyteros & Diaconos.*

*John Lambert*, a holy Martyr, saith, Fox's Acts In the primitive Church, when *Virtue and Mon. bare* (as ancient Doctors do deem, and Scripture in mine Opinion recordeth the same) most room, there were no more Officers

Officers in the Church of God, then Bishops and Deacons.

The same was the Judgment of *Tindal and Baynes*.

The Protestant Church of *England* was of the same mind.

*The Institution of a Christian Man*, made by the whole Clergy in their Provincial Synod, Anno 1537. set forth by King and Parliament, and commanded to be preached to the whole Kingdom, mentions but two Orders, Bishops or Presbyters, and Deacons. *In Novo Testamento nulla mentio facta est aliorum graduum, aut distinctionum in Ordinibus, sed Diaconorum, vel Ministrorum, & Presbyterorum, sive Episcorum.*

To which agrees the MS. mention'd by the now Bishop of Worcester, setting forth the Judgment of Arch-Bishop *Cranmer*, That *Bishops and Priests were one Office in the beginning of Christ's Religion*. The Bishop of St. *Asaph, Thirlby, See Dr. Redman, Cox*, all employed in that Convention were of the same Opinion, *that at first Bishops and Presbyters were p. 228. same*. *Redman and Cox expressly cite the Judgment of Jerom with approbation.*

The Learned Bishop concludes his Discourse of Arch Bishop Cranmer thus; *Iren. p. 393.* We see by the Testimony of him who was instrumental in our Reformation, that he denied not Episcopacy as a distinct Order from Presbytery, of Divine Right; but only as a prudent Constitution of the CIVIL MAGISTRATE, for the better governing of the Church.

The same Arch-Bishop Cranmer was the first of six and forty who in the time of King H. 8. affirmed (in a Book called, *The Bishops Book*, to be seen in Fox's *Martyrology*) that the difference of Bishops and Presbyters was a Device of the ancient Fathers, and not mentioned in Scripture.

Our Learned Writers against the Papists are of the same mind,

See part. 2. e. 3. divis. 5. &c. 9. di. viii. i. Bishop Jewel in the Defence of his Apology, proves against Harding, that *Aetius* could not be accounted a Heretic for holding that Bishops and Presbyters are all one *True Divino*: and citing *Jerom*, &c. concludes in these words, *All these, with many more before the Fathers, together with the Apostle St Paul, for thus saying, must by Harding advise be held for Heretics.*

The same is affirmed by Bishop Morton in his *Cath. Appeal.* by Bishop Bilson against Seminaries. Dr. Whittaker *Resp. ad Camp. Rationes,* Dr. Fulk upon *Tit. I. 5.* Dean Nowell, Dr. Stillingfleet Bishop of Worcester, in his *Irenic.* Dr. Burnet Bishop of Salisbury, in his *Vindication of the Church of Scotland,* his words are these: *I acknowledge Bishop and Presbyter to be one and the same Office, and so plead for no new Office-bearer in the Church — The first branch of their power is their Authority to publish the Gospel, to manage the Worship, and to dispense the Sacraments: and this is all that is of Divine Right in the Ministry, in which Bishops and Presbyters are equal sharers.* p. 331.

The truth is, this Notion of the *Jus Divinum* of Episcopacy, as a superior Order, was first promoted in the Church of England by Arch-Bishop Laud. Dr. Holland, the King's Professor of Divinity in Oxon, was much offended with Dr. Laud, for asserting it in a Disputation for his Degrees, he checked him publickly, and told him, *He was a Schismatick, and went about to make a division between the English and other Re-*

*formed Churches.* This Prelate had injured his Tongue to say, *Ecclesia Romana, and Turba Genevensis.*

Exomolog.  
c.7.p.37.

*Cressy, who apostatized to the Romish Church, conceives that the reason why Episcopacy took no firm rooting in the Consciences of English Subjects before Archbishop Lauds time, was because the Succession and Authority of Bishops, and other Ecclesiastical Orders received from the Roman Church, was never confidently and generally taught in England to be of Divine Right.* His Disciples since have rectified that Errour, by obliging all the Conforming Ministers to subscribe,

Vid. Pref.  
to the Book  
of Ordin.

*that Episcopacy is a distinct Order, and that it is manifest in God's Word, that it is so : This goes beyond the determination of the Council of Trent. And to make the Fabrick lasting, which was built upon this new Foundation, all Ministers must be sworn to support it, and that they will not remove one Stone out of the Building by any endeavours to alter the Government, as established in Church and State. The Substance of this Oath, as it relates to Ecclesiastical Government, is the same with the &c. Oath, which was imposed in the year 1640. only*

it

it includes also the Civil Government, and requires Passive Obedience and Non-resistance in all Cases whatever, which rendred it acceptable to the Powers then in being, and gave them encouragement to trample upon Fundamental Laws and Constitutions, as presuming upon the security of an Oath, that *neither they, nor any commissioned by them, must be resisted upon any pretence whatsoever.*

The Proofs brought for this distinction and superiority of Order are so very weak, that scarce two of the Asserters of Episcopacy agree in any one of them. No Scripture, no primitive General Council, no general Consent of primitive Doctors and Fathers, no not one Father of note in the first Ages, speak particularly and home to this purpose.

The Point of Re-ordination began to be urged here in Arch-Bishop *Laud's* time, his Influence was such, and the Cause then in hand did work so powerfully upon good Bishop *Hall* himself, that he adventured, as Mr. *Prin* tells us, to Re-ordain Mr. *John Dury*, though he had been before Ordained in some

Reformed Church. But from the beginning it was not so. The old Church of England did not require Re-ordination, as is now done.

In King Edward the Sixth his time, *Peter Martyr, Martin Bucer, and P. Fabius* had Ecclesiastical Preferments in the Church of England, but *Cranmer*, whose Judgment of Episcopacy we have seen before, never required Re-ordination of them. He was most familiar with *Martyr*, nether did he censure *M. Bucer* for writing that Presbyters might Ordain.

*John à Lasco*, with his Congregation of *Germans*, was settled in *England* by *Edward the Sixth's Patent*, he to be Super-intendent, and four other Ministers with him; and though he wrote against some Orders of our Church, was with others called to Reform our Ecclesiastical Laws.

In Queen *Elizabeth's time*, Ordination by Presbyters was allowed, as appears by the Statute of Reformation, *Ec. 13 Eliz cap. 12.* It cannot refer to Popish Ordinations only, if at all. For, 1. the words are general, *Be it enacted—that every person—which doth*

*Vid. Buc.  
script. An-  
gl. p. 154.*

*Burn. Hist.* *154, 197.*

or shall pretend to be a Priest, or Minister of God's holy Word. The Title of Minister of God's holy Word is rarely used among the Papists, and in common use among the Reformed Churches. The Ministry with the Papists is a real Priesthood, and therefore they call their Presbyters Priests. And it's an old Maxim, *Non est distinguendum ubi Lex non distinguit.* 2. The Subscription seems to intend those that scrupled Traditions and Ceremonies, which the Papists do not. For the assent and subscription required is, to all the Articles of Religion, which only concern the Confession of the true Christian Faith, and the Doctrine of the Sacraments. By this they gave Indulgence to those that were not satisfied to Subscribe all the Articles absolutely, because the Approbation of the Homilies, and Book of Consecration were included in them, which are no Articles of the Catholick Church, but private Articles of the Church of England; as Mr. T. Rogers observes. Therefore the Statute requires Subscription only to the Doctrine of Faith and of the Sacraments.

Cone. Trid.Seff. 23.Can. I.Rogers in  
Art. 35, 36.

## A P L E A for

By the way, I cannot but take notice of the following Clause in that Statute — *If any Person Ecclesiastical — shall advisedly maintain or affirm any Doctrine directly contrary, or repugnant to any of the said Articles, and being convented before the Bishop of the Diocess, or the Ordinary, or before the Queen's Commissioners in Causes Ecclesiastical, shall persist therein, and not revoke his Errour, or after such Revocation eftsoons affirm such untrue Doctrine; such maintaining, or affirming, or persisting — shall be just cause to deprive such Person of his Ecclesiastical Promotions: And it shall be lawful to the Bishop of the Diocess, or the said Commissioners to deprive such a Person so persisting — and upon such Sentence of Deprivation pronounced, he shall be indeed deprived.* Quære, Whether the Profession of Arminianism be not directly contrary to the Seventeenth Article of Predestination and Election, to the Tenth Article of Free-will, and to the Thirteenth of Works preparatory to Grace? and if so, Whether the Guilty do not deserve Deprivation by this Statute? The best of it is, they are like to

meet

meet with favourable Judges, who will not be over-strict to mark the Errors of those, who do but write after the Copy they have set before them. Surely the Case is altered from what it was formerly : It was *Baro's* unhappiness that he lived in a peevish Age, for when he delivered himself unwarily in favour of those Opinions, the Heads of the University of *Cambridge* sent up Dr. *Whittaker* and Dr. *Tindal* to Arch-Bishop *Whitgift*, that by the interposition of his Authority those Errors might be crushed in the Egg. Hereupon *Baro*, being obnoxious to this Statute, was expelled the University, and the *Lambeth*-Articles were made, which come nothing short of the Determinations of *Dort*. But *tempora mutantur, nos & mutamur in illis.* But to return from this short digression ; some that were Ordained by Presbyters were admitted to the Publick Exercise of their Ministry, and had Preferment in the Church of *England* without Re-ordination in Queen *Elizabeth's* time.

Mr. *William Whittingham* was made Dean of *Durham* about 1563. though Ordained by Presbyters only.

Mr.

Mr. *Travers*, Ordained by a Presbytery beyond Sea, was Seven years Lecturer in the *Temple*, and had the Bishop of *London's* Letter for it. In his Supplication to the Council printed at the end of Mr. *Hooker's* *Ecclesiastical Politique*. he saith, One reason why he was Suspended by Arch-Bishop *Whitgift* was because not lawfully called (in *Whitgift's* Opinion) to the Ministry, nor allowed to preach according to the Laws of this Church. But Mr. *Hooker* in his Answer wholly waves that, and Replies only to the Contests between them.

The French Church in *Thread-needle-Street* was allowed by the Queen, as also the Dutch Church. In the Year 1684. a *Quo Warranto* was brought against them.

In King *James the First* his time, the like allowance was made unto Ministers Ordained by Presbyters.

*Job. Cam.*  
Icon. ante  
Myroth.  
Evang.

The famous Mr. *John Camero*, who was Ordained in *France*, came hither in the Year 1621. and set up a Divinity-Lecture in a private House in *London*, by the Permission of King *James the First*, and a License from the then Bishop of *London*.

Be-

Before the Consecration of the three Scottish Bishops at London, Andrews Bishop of Ely said, They must be first Ordained, as having received no Ordination by a Bishop. Bancroft Arch-Bishop of Canterbury maintain'd, That thereof there was no necessity, seeing where Bishops could not be had; the Ordination given by Presbyters must be esteemed lawful, <sup>Spotsw.</sup> Hist. lib. 7. p. 514. otherwise it might be doubted, if there was any lawful Vocation in most of the Reformed Churches. This applauded to by the other Bishops, Ely acquiesced, and the three Bishops were consecrated.

Thus we see the Judgment and Practice of the Old Church of England in King Edward the Sixth's time, in Queen Elizabeth's, and in King James the First his time, they required not Re-ordination, as the New Conformity doth since the Year 1660. They acted from Catholick Principles that comprehended the Foreign Ordinations, asserting the Identity of Bishops and Presbyters.

*Object.* *Aerius* is branded for an Heretick by *Austin* and *Epiphanius*, for affirming Bishops and Presbyters to be the same. So Bishop *Hall* in his Divine Right

Right of Episcopacy, Part I. pag. 64.

*Answ.* The great mannagers of this Objection are the Papists (as we observed before) from whom some Defenders of Episcopacy have borrowed it. That *Aerius* was a Heretick is past doubt; but he is so called by the Fathers, because he was an *Arian*: *Epiphanius* saith, he did *Arium ipsum dogmatum novitate superare*. *Austin* saith, in *Arianorum hærefin lapsus*, which is more then a favouring of it, as some interpret their words. Several of our Learned Writers against Popery have justified him against the Charge of Heresie, for holding the equality of Bishops and Presbyters. *Chemnit. exam. Conc. Trid. part. 4.*

*Epib. Hz-*  
ref. 75.  
*Aust. de*  
*Her. 53.*

---

C H A P. X.

*Instances of Ordination by Presbyters in the Primitive Church.*

1. At Alexandria.
2. At Sce-tis by Paphnutius.
3. By the Presbyters mentioned by Leo the Great.
4. By the Captive Presbyters beyond Ister.
5. By the Boiarii.
6. By the Presbyters Ordained by Meletius.
7. By the Presbyters mentioned by Hilary the Deacon.
8. By Andreas Presbyter de Hostia.
9. By the Choropiscopi.
10. By the Presbyters at Hy. Objections answered.
11. By the Ancient Waldenses.
12. By Wickliff's Followers in England.
13. By the Presbyter of Taprobane.

THAT

Arg. IX. THAT Ordination which was valid in the Primitive Church is valid now: But Ordination by meer Presbyters was valid in the Primitive Church; Therefore it is valid now.

The Major will be granted. The Minor I prove.

I: The Presbyters of Alexandria made their Bishops for almost two hundred years together. *Jerom* \* having shewed at large from the Epistles of Peter, Paul, and John, That Bishops and Presbyters were the same at first, he adds. *Quod autem postea unus electus est qui cæteris preponeretur, in Schismatis remedium factum est, ne unusquisque ad se trahens Christi Ecclesiam, rumperet: Nam & Alexandria a Marco Evangelista usque ad Heracliam & Dionysium Episcopos, Presbyteri semper unum ex se electum, in excelliori gradu colloquum Episcopum nominabant: quomodo si exercitus Imperatorem faciat, aut Diaconi eligant ex se quem industrium moverint, & Archidiaconum vocant.*

Note here, i. That *Jerom* undertaking to shew the Original way of making

\* Ad E-  
vagr.

king Bisho<sup>s</sup> of *Alexandria*, wold leave nothing out that was material in the Constituting of them.

2. He mentions no other way of Constituting them but this by the Presbyters.

3. He brings this as an Argument of the Identity of Bishops and Presbyters, that Presbyters at first made Bishops: A Bishop in *Jerom's Opinion* is that to the Presbyters, that an Arch-deacon is to the Deacons. As an Arch-deacon chosen out of the Deacons is but a Deacon still, though the chief Deacon; so a Bishop set over Presbyters is but a Presbyter still, though the chief Presbyter. *Is Episcopus qui inter Presbyteros primus.* The other Comparison of an Army making their General, is not between the power of a General and that of a Bishop, but it respects only the manner of their Creation. As a General is made by the consent and choice of an Army; so Bishops had their first being from the Presbyters consent.

4. He ascribeth to the Presbyters the election, the placing him in a higher degree, and the naming of him a Bishop.

Nei-

Hilar. in  
Ambr. in  
Tit. 3.

*De Invent.  
ter. I. 4. c. 6.*

Neither do we read of any other Consecration. *Polydor Virgil* confesseth that anciently in the making of a Bishop, there were no Ceremonies used, but the People met together to give their Testimony and Suffrage in their Election, both Ministers and People did pray, and Presbyters gave Imposition of Hands.

5. He saith the Custom was changed from the time of *Heracles* and *Dionyfus*. What Custom? not the Election of a Bishop by Presbyters and People, for that continued long after: Therefore it must be the Constitution, which afterwards was done by neighbouring Bishops in the way of Consecration.

This Testimony of *Jerom* is seconded by a more full one of *Eutychius Patriarch of Alexandria*, who out of the Records and Traditions of that Church, in his *Arabick Originals* thereof, saith, (according to *Selden's Translation* in his Comment. p. 29, 30.) *Constituit item Marcus Evangelista, duodecim Presbyteros cum Hananiâ, qui semper manerent cum Patriarchâ, ad eum ut cum vacaret Patriarchatus eligerent unum e duodecim Presbyteris, cujus capiti reliqui undecim manus*

manus imponerent, eumque benedicerent, & Patriarcham eum crearent: & dein virum aliquem insignem eligerent, eumque Presbyterum secum constituerent, loco ejus qui sic factus est Patriarcha, ita ut semper extarent duodecim. Neque desit Alexandriæ institutum hoc de Presbyteris, ut scilicet Patriarchæ crearentur è Presbyteris duodecim, usque ad tempora Alexandri Patriarchæ Alexandrini, qui fuit ex numero illo 318. Is autem vetuit, nè deinceps Patriarcham Presbyteri crearent, & decrevit ut mortuo Patriarchâ convenienter Episcopî qui Patriarcham Ordinarent. Decrevit item ut vacante Patriarchatu, eligerent five ex quacunque regione, five ex duodecim illis Presbyteris, five aliis ut res ferebat, virum aliquem eximium, eumque Patriarcham vocarent; atque ita evanuit institutum illud antiquius, quo creari solitus à Presbyteris Patriarcha, & successit in locum ejus decretum de Patriarcha ab Episcopis creando.

Here is a full proof of Presbyters choosing and creating their Bishop, (whom *Eutychius* speaking in the language of his Age, calls Patriarch) and that by Imposition of Hands and Benediction,

diction, or Prayer, without any other Consecration, which Custom continued several Ages, until at last the neighbouring Bishops usurped the power of Consecration, and left the Presbyters neither the Choice nor the Creation of their Bishop.

Here we have also an Instance of Presbyters making Presbyters ; for *Eutychius* tells us, That the same Presbyters that made their Bishop, chose and ordained another person Presbyter in his room ; and so constituted both Presbyters and Bishops for several Ages together.

II. The Bishop of Worcester tells us out of *Johannes Cassianus*, that about the Year 390. one Abbot *Daniel*, infilling. I. riour to none in the Desert of *Scetis*, ren. p. 380. was made a Deacon, à *B. Papnuto* solitudinis ejusdem Presbytero, in tantum enim virtutibus ejus adgaudebat, ut quem vitæ merits sibi & gratiâ parem noverat, coæquare sibi etiam Sacerdotii honore festinaret ; Siquidem nequaquam fereens in inferiore eum Ministerio diutius immorari, optansque fibimet successionem dignissimam providere, superstes eum Presbyterij honore provexit.

Here

Here is a Presbyter Ordained by a Presbyter, which we no where read was pronounced null by *Theophilus*, then Bishop of *Alexandria*, or any other of that time. Had it been either irregular or unusual, doubtless it had been censured.

Possibly the Concession in the Canon Law is grounded upon this Example, *Abbas si est Presbyter conserre potest ordinem Clericalem.* Decret. Greg. lib. 1. Tit. 14. c. 11. Innocent. 3.

III. *Leo Mag.* being consulted by *Rufinus Narbonensis*, about some Presbyters that took upon them to Ordain as Bishops, resolves the Case thus; *Nulla ratio finit, nt inter Episcopos habeantur qui nec in Clericis sunt electi, nec à plebibus expetiti, nec à provincialibus Episcopis cum Metropolitani judicio consecrati.* *Unde cum saepe quæstio de male accepto honore nascatur, quis ambigat, NEQUAQUAM ISTIS TRIBUENDVM quod non doceatur fuisse collatum?* *si qui autem Clerici Leon:Epist. ab istis Pseudo-episcopis in eis Ecclesiis 92. ad Rufi. ordinati sunt, quæ ad proprios Episcopos Narbon.C. I pertinebant, & Ordinatio eorum cum consensu & judicio præsidentium facta est,*

A P L E A for  
*poteſt rata haberi, ita ut in iſpis Eccleſiis  
perfeverent.*

Two things are remarkable in this Decision of *Leo* the Great,

1. They that want the Election of the Clergy, and are not desired by the People, nor Consecrated by the Bishops of the Province, &c. are *Pseudo-episcopi*, false Bishops in *Leo's* Opinion, which is agreeable to the old Canons, as we observed before. Our English Bishops want the Election of the Clergy and People, and therefore their Ordinations have a Canonical nullity in them. They would have been reckon'd but *Pseudo-episcopi* in *Leo's* time.

2. The Consent *ex post facto* of the true Bishops, made the Ordinations of meer Presbyters lawful, which could not be unless they had an intrinsick power of Ordination, which was only restrained by the Laws of the Church; for if they have no power of Ordination, it is impossible they should confer any by their Ordination. The bare consent of the true Bishops could not have made them Ministers, if they had not been such before.

IV. The power of Ordination and Government was in the Hands of the Captive Presbyters under the *Seythians* beyond *Ister* for about Seventy years, from the Year 260 to the Year 327; *Philoborg.* the former being the Year of their <sup>lib 2. cap. 5</sup> *Captivity under Galienus*, the latter of <sup>in Blond.</sup> *Apol.* the Change of the Government under *Constantine*, when *Urbphilas* was created Bishop by *Eusebius*, and others.

V. The Presbyters of *Bavaria* Ordained Ministers time out of mind, until at last Pope *Zachary* sent one *Vivilo* to them for their Bishop. It is certain that when *Bonifacius Mogunt.* alias *Winifrid*, visited them, he found no Bishops in the whole Province but this *Vivilo* of the Pope's sending not long before; though the Province be so large that one third part of it now, viz. the district of *Salzburg*, hath an Arch-bishop, *Heyl. Cosm.* <sup>I. 2. p. 368.</sup> *who is the most powerful Prelate for Revenue and Jurisdiction of any in Germany.* The *Boarians*, who were the ancient Inhabitants of this Province, were govern'd by their Presbyters without Bishops, and in all probability had

been so from their first Conversion, which was about 200 years before. For they were converted to the Christian Faith about the Year 540, and *Vivilo* was imposed upon them about the Year 740 by Pope *Zachary*; who thus writes to *Winifrid*, or *Wilfred* (as some write his Name) *Quia indicasti perrexisse te ad gentem Boiriorum, & invenisse eos extra Ordinem Ecclesiasticum viventes, dum Episcopos non habebant in Provincia nisi unum, nomine Vivilo, quem nos*

*Bonif. Mo- ante tempus Ordinavimus, Presbyteros  
gunt. Ep. 120. verò quos ibidem reperiisti, si incogniti  
Aut. Bib. fuerint Viri illi à quibus sunt Ordinati,  
Parr. Tom. 2. p. 105. & dubium est eos Episcopos fuisse, an non,*

*qui eos ordinaverunt — ab Episcopo suo  
benedictiones Presbyteratus suscipiant, &  
consecrentur, & sic Ministerio suo fungan-  
tur. It is no wonder that this Pope re-  
quires Re-ordination, for now *Rome* had  
usurped the Universal Headship, and as-  
sumed a power of Depositing and Setting  
up of Princes, as this Man did in the  
Case of *Childerik* and *Pipin*. They  
that brought Kings and Princes under  
them, would much more make Pres-  
byters to depend upon them.*

VI. The Council of Nice decreed thus concerning the Presbyters Ordained by Meletius at Alexandria, &c. *Hi autem qui Dei gratiâ & nostris precibus adjuti, ad nullum Schisma deflexisse com-* Socrat. in Mr. Baxt. of Episc. P. 226.

*perti sunt, sed se intra Catholicæ & Apostolicæ Ecclesiæ fines ab erroris labe vacuos continuerint, authoritatem habeant T U M MINISTROS ORDINANDI, tum eos qui Clero digni fuerint nominandi, tum denique omnia ex lege & instituto Ecclesiastico liberè exequendi.* If any say, that the meaning is, that these Presbyters shall Ordain and Govern with the Bishops, but not without them, it is granted; for the Decree refers to *instituta Ecclesiastica*: But this sheweth that Ordination belongeth to the Presbyters Office, and consequently it is no nullity (though an irregularity as to the Canons) when it's done by them alone.

If it be said, this Condemns Schismatical Ordinations; I answer, Schism, as such, cannot make Ordination null, though it implies an irregularity, else the Ordinations of the Schismatical Church of Rome were null, which are counted valid in England.

Q. 101.

VII. Hilary, or whoever was the Author in *Q. ex utroque Test. mixtim,* affirms, That in Alexandriâ & per totum Ægyptum si desit Episcopus, consecrat Presbyter. It cannot be said that *Consecrare* here signifies the Consecration of the Eucharist, for this might be done by the Presbyter, *præsente Episcopo.* If it be taken for Confirmation, it doth not prejudice our Cause; for the Canon limits the power of Confirmation, as well as Ordination to the Bishop, as was also the power of Consecrating Churches, if any should take the word in that sense.

We may understand the meaning by Comment. a parallel place of Hilary in Ambrose, in Eph. 4. who thus speaks :

*Ideo non per omnia convenientia scripta Apostoli Ordinationi quæ nunc in Ecclesiâ est, quia hæc inter ipsa primordia sunt scripta; nam & Timotheum ( 1 Tim. 4. 14. 2 Tim. 1. 6. Presbyterum à se creatum) Episcopum vocat, quia primum Presbyteri Episcopi appellabantur, ut receidente uno, sequens ei succederet. Denique apud Ægyptum Presbyteri consignant, si præsens non sit Episcopus. Sed quia cœperunt sequentes Presbyteri indigni inventi*

veniri ad primatus tenendos, immutata est ratio, prospiciente Concilio, ut non Ordo, sed meritum crearet Episcopum, multorum Sacerdotum judicio constitutum, nè indignus temere usurparet, & esset multis scandalum.

The same Author saith also, *in Tim. 3. Hilar. post Episcopum, Diaconi Ordinem subjicit.* Diac. in Tim. 3. Quare, nisi quia Episcopi & Presbyteri una Ordinatio est? Ut ergo enim Sacerdos est, sed Episcopus primus est.

Here note,

1. That the Ordination in *Hilary's* time did not in all things agree with the Writings of the Apostle. That he speaks of the Ordination of Ministers is evident by the following words, *Prefbyterum à se creatum, &c.*

2. At first Presbyters and Bishops were of the same Order and Office, and had but one Ordination. *Episcopi & Presbyteri una Ordinatio est*, which shews the meaning of *Ordinatio* in the former Paragraph. The Bishop in *Hilary's* time, which was about the Year 380, under *Damasus* \*, was but \* *Hilarib.* *primus Sacerdos*, and not of a superior Order: Peter is called πρώτος, *primus Apostolus*, *Matth. 10. 2.* and yet Protestants

testants hold all the Apostles to be equal.

De Repub.  
Eccl. 3. c.  
3.

3. *Spalatensis* infers from this quotation, That at the beginning when a Bishop died, there was not so much as an Election of him that was to succeed (much less any new Ordination) but the eldest Presbyter came into the room of the deceased Bishop. See the Preface to *Blondel's Apology*, p. 11. & 31.

4. There was a Change in the way of choosing their Bishop, *ut non ordo, sed meritum crearet Episcopum*; and this was *prospiciente Concilio*; whether that Council was the Council of *Nice, Can.*

4. as *Blondel* thinks; for it should seem that before that time neither the Consent of the Bishops of the Province, nor the Concurrence of three Bishops in Ordination, were accounted necessary for the making of a Bishop, though it might be the Custom (for the keeping up of Unity) in some places: Or whether it signifies no more then that which *Jerom* calls *Concilium Presbyterorum*, the Bench of Presbyters, who might make this Change by general Consent; *Multorum Sacerdotum judicio*, as *Hilarius* speaks: Or whether it were some *Council,*

cil, of which we have no further account in Antiquity, most of the Records of the three first Centuries being lost \*, is not very material. It might \* vid. Eus. lib. III. 4. be some Provincial Synod, of which there were several before that of Nice ||. Eus. Eccl. Hist. v. It is presumption in us that live at this distance, to say there was no such Council.<sup>23</sup> When an Ancient Writer so positively affirmeth it. Such a Change there was, and that by the advice of some Council; they that say there was no such Council, must disprove it by some positive Authentick Testimony.

5. After this Change the Presbyters chose, and made their Bishop: For so Hilarius affirms him to be, *multorum Sacerdotum judicio constitutum.*

6. He adds, that in *Egypt Presbyteri consignant, si præsens non sit Episcopus.* He speaks in the foregoing words of the Identity of Bishops and Presbyters, and he brings this as a Confirmation of it, that in the absence of the Bishop they might do those things which Custom had appropriated to the Bishops. *Consignare* is some Act of Prerogative that the Bishops challenged to themselves, which yet in their absence the Presbyters

ters might perform. Whether we understand it of Ordination, or Confirmation, in which they did *Chrysma consignare*, it's not material, for both were reserved to the Bishop by the Canons: Though by comparing this with the scope of *Hilary's Discourse*, and with the quotation out of the Questions under *Austin's Name*— *Si degit Episcopus, consecrat Presbyter*, it should seem evidently meant of Ordination; especially when we find *consignare* to be taken for *consecrare* in several Authors, *Arnob. lib. 3. Cypr. Ep. 2. Tu tantum quem jam Spiritualibus castris cœlestis militia signavit.*

*Anastas. de  
vit. Pontif.  
p. 53.*

VIII. *Pelagius* the first Bishop of *Rome* was Ordained by *John Bishop of Perusia, Bonus Bishop of Florence, and Andreas Presbyter de Hostia*, whereas by the Canons three Bishops are absolutely necessary for the Ordination of a Bishop: Either then *Pelagius* was no Canonical Bishop, and the Succession was interrupted in the Church of *Rome*, and consequently the *English Bishops* have no Canonical Succession; or else a Presbyter hath the same intrinsical power

of

of Ordination with a Bishop , but it's only restrained by Ecclesiastical Laws. This Instance is quoted in Dr. *Stillingf.*  
*Iren.*

IX. The *Chorepiscopi*, or Country-Bishops Ordained Presbyters until they were restrained by a Canon in the Council of *Antioch*, A.D. 344. Now these *Chorepiscopi* were either of the Order of <sup>Antioch.</sup> <sub>Conc. Can.</sub> <sup>10.</sup> Bishops, or not : If they were , then it appears that Bishops were made not only in Cities , but in Country Villages, which were but thinly peopled with Christians , when the Majority were Heathens, or at least were great numbers. By which we may guess at the bigness of primitive Diocesses ; which were scarce as large as our lesser Parishes. Such Bishops in the Exercise of that power which Christ gave them, without Canonical Restraints, we plead for, and earnestly desire. Nay the *Chorepiscopi* are an Instance of Bishops without subject Presbyters ; they were but Parish-Bishops under the City-Bishop.

*Sine autoritate literarum ejus in una- Ancyra.*  
queaque Parochia *Chorepiscopis non licet* <sup>Conc. Can.</sup> <sub>13.</sub> *aliquid agere.* But if they were not

Bishops,

Bishops, then it's undeniable that Presbyters did Ordain then, without Bishops, and their Ordination was valid, until they were limited by the Canons. The second Council of *Hispalis* makes the *Chorepiscopi* and Presbyters to be the same \*.

\* Can. 7.

*Forb's Iren.  
cap. II.*

As to *Bellarmino's* conceit of two sorts of Choral Bishops, some meer Presbyters, others *veri nominis Episcopi*, he is answered at large by *Forbes* in his *Irenic. c. II.*

X. The Histories of *Scotland* do tell us that their Churches were governed by Presbyters without Bishops for above two hundred years, and therefore had no Ordination but by Presbyters.

*Hector Boetius* saith, *Ante Palladium populi Suffragiis ex Monachis & Culdaeis pontifices assumerentur. Hist. Scot. lib. 7. fol. 128.*

*De Gest. John Major* is more express, *Priori-Scot. l. 2. c. 2 bus illis temporibus, per Sacerdotes & Monachos sine Episcopis Scotti in fide erudi- tisi sunt.*

*John*

*John Fordon* justifies this Custom as agreeable to the primitive Church. *An-* Scott  
*te Palladii adventum habebant Scotti fidei* Chron. l. 3.  
*c. 8.*

*Doctores ac Sacramentorum Ministrato-*  
*res Presbyteros solummodo vel Monachos,*  
*Ritum sequentes Ecclesiae primitivae.* Bi-  
 shop *Usher* cites this last with appro-  
 bation. *De primord. Eccl. Brit.* p. 798,  
 799, 800.

These Authors call the ancient In-  
 habitants of *Scotland* by the name they  
 were known by in their days.

*Object.* Some to elude these Testimo-  
 nies, deny that there was any Conver-  
 sion of the ancient Inhabitants of that  
 part of *Brittain*, which we now call  
*Scotland*, before *Palladius* his time, or  
 neer it. The *South-Picts* they would  
 have converted not till *A. D. 432.* the  
*North-Picts* in the Year *560.*

*Answe.* I deny not but there might be  
 a more general Conversion of that Na-  
 tion at those times; the Christian Re-  
 ligion, which was over-grown with *Bid. Hist.*  
 Heathenism, and other Errors, might <sup>III 4.</sup>  
 be revived, and recovered to its primi-  
 tive Lustre by the preaching of *Nennia-*  
*nus* and *Columba.*

Indeed

## A P L E A for

Indeed *Bede* saith, *Erat autem Columba primus Doctor fidei Christianæ transmontanis Pictis ad Aquilonem.* He was the first he knew of, who lived two hundred years after the said Conversion. For he ends his History with the Year 766. It is acknowledged that they were mixed with *Scots* or *Irish* at this time, a barbarous People, and in all likelihood Heathens, who having made themselves Masters of all, must needs bring Christianity to a low ebb in that Country. The converting of these to the Christian Faith was the first Conversion that *Bede* knew of. But that Christianity was much more early in that Kingdom, is proved by Dr. *Cowper*, a Scotch Bishop. He affirms the Conversion of the North Part of *Brittany* to be as early, if not earlier, than the Conversion of the South Part. He proves out of *Dorotheus Synops.* and *Nicæphor.* II.40. that *Simon Zelotes* preached the Gospel in *Brittany*, where he was Martyr'd and Interr'd. This was *An. 44. Christi.* He proves out of *Balæus*, *Fleming*, &c. that *Joseph of Arimathea* came into *Brittany*, about the Year 35. He proves out of *Theodore*, that *Paul*

*Comp. 2d  
days Con-  
ference.*

after

after his Deliverance under Nero, came into Brittain. Cent. I. lib. I. c. 10. And then brings in the Papists objecting, *What is this to Scotland?* He answereth?

*What Good or Evil especially in Religion hath come to the one, hath been found by manifold experience easily derived to the other.* Hesaih further, out of their own Chronicles, That A.D. 124. when K. Lucius embraced the Christian Faith in the South part of the Isle, in that same year, Donald King of the North part of it became a Christian, and that when ( A. 300. ) under Dioclesian the Church of South Brittain was persecuted by his Deputies, many fled to Crachlint [ or Cratilinth ] King of Scots, who did lovingly receive them, and assigned to them the Isle of Man, and erected there a Temple dedicated to Christ, called otherwise Sodorensis Ecclesia. He quotes also that known place of Tertullian, *adv. Jud.* c. 7,8. Britannorum loca Romanis inaccessa Christo subdita sunt. Now what part of Brittain he means ( saith the Bishop ) your own Cardinal Baronius will declare unto you — It's evident ( saith Baronius ) that Britannia was divided by a Wall built by Adrian, &c. that part within

L was

was possest by the Romans, the other without, Britanni liberè possederunt, qui sæpe muros illos egressi Romanos præliis provocarunt. For this cause, saith he, Petrus Cluniacensis vocat Scotos antiquiores Christianos. Cent. 3.c.3. & 2.c.2. Thus far the Bishop.

I would further be resolved in these Queries.

1. When the Fathers mention *Joseph of Arimathea, Simeon Zelotes, &c.* to have preached the Gospel in *Brittain*, what reason have we to exclude *North-Brittain* from partaking in the blessing? The whole Island, *Scotland* and *England*, was then called *Britain*. It is most reasonable to think that those Apostles and Apostolical Men that came into this Land, did cause the joyful sound of the Gospel to be heard in every part of the Island, North as well as South. When we consider their Zeal, unwearied Endeavours, together with the wonderful Success attending their Ministry, it is not likely that *Scotland* remained long in Heathenism, after the Conversion of *South-Brittain*. And can it be imagined that the Christians of *South-Brittain* were so cruelly uncharitable as not to

en-

endeavour the propagation of the Gospel among their Country-men and Neighbours of *North-Britain*, especially under King *Lucius*, in whose time Christianity may be supposed to be the publick Profession of the Land. To this add, that a great part of that we call *Scotland* now, belonged then to the Dominions of the *British Kings*, who doubtless endeavoured the planting of Christianity among all their Subjects.

2. If the Inhabitants of *North-Britain* received their first Conversion by Men sent from *Rome*, as *Bede* suggests, <sup>*Bid. Hist.*</sup> how comes it to pass that for so long a time after, they kept their *Easter* after the Eastern manner, and not after the Roman? When the *Saxon-Roman-Bishops* imposed Conformity in this particular, they opposed them for a long time, and Bishop *Colman* (who came <sup>*Bid. ib. 25*</sup> from *Scotland*) left his Charge, rather than Conform, about the Year 664.

The *Picts* and *Britains* were as rigid Nonconformists as he in this Point, and are termed by *Wilfride*, at a publick Disputation, *obstinationis eorum complices*. Their Bishop *Dagamus* refused all Communion with the *Roman* <sup>\**Bid. ib. c. 25*</sup> Bishops,

Bed. II.4. Bishops, and would not as much as eat with them in the same House.

As the *Roman* Bishops were growing in greatness, and arriving towards the Perfection of the *Man of Sin*, they sent their Bishops to most Nations, to bring them to a dependence upon them ; so they did send *Palladius* to *Ireland*, *Ny-*

\**Bed. Hist. Inias* to *Scotland*, \* *Austin* to *England*,

27. *Vivilo* to the *Boarians*, as we observed before.

*Bede* himself acknowledges that the first Bishop the *Scots* had was *Palladius*, though they were Christians before ;

Bed. I.13. *Palladius ad Scotos in Christum credentes à Pontifice Romanae Ecclesiae Celestino primus mittitur Episcopus*. He did not make them Christians, but found them so.

It is objected further, out of *Bede*, That *Britain* in *Palladius*'s time had such Bishops as were in all other parts of the *Roman Empire*.

Ecccl. Hist. III.21. Answ. *Bede* acknowledges that the *British* and *Scotch* Bishops were many of them Ordained only by one Bishop. They were not then such Bishops as were in all other parts of the *Roman Empire*; for in other parts of the Empire they

they were Ordained by three Bishops, according to the fourth Canon of the Council of *Nice*. It's an evidence that they thought themselves not obliged by General Councils.

But suppose there were such Bishops here, as were in all other parts of the *Roman Empire*, as it is not very unlikely but the Church-Government of *Britain*, being a Province of that Empire, might be in some degree modelled according to the Forms used in other parts of the Empire. The Hierarchy in the Churches of that Empire had its Pattern from the Heathen. The Heathen had their *Sacerdotes*, and over them their *Pontifices maximos* \*

\* *Araob.*  
*cont. Gent.*  
*Lib. V.*

In every Province, one chief Priest had the Supream Power, to whom all the other Priests were subject. And these were chosen *ex hominibus qui in negotiis Civilibus, & rebus publicis erant illustrissimi* ||. See the Epistle of *Julian* || *Eusib.* to *Arsacius*, Chief-Priest of *Galatia*, in *VIII 15. & IX.4.* *Sozom.* V. 16. Here is a President for Bishops intermeddling in State Affairs.

The Office of these Chief-Priests was *Jul. Ep.* to Ordain and Govern the inferiour *Ibid.* Priests.

The Master of the Sentences ingenuously confesseth that the distinction of Bishops, Metropolitans, Arch-Bishops, was borrowed of the Gentiles. Thus he :

Lib.4. dist. 25. m. *Ordo Episcoporum quadripartitus est, scil. in Patriarchis, Archiepiscopis, Metropolitanis & Episcopis — vorum autem discretio à Gentilibus introducta videtur, qui suos Flamines, alios simpliciter Flamines, alios Archi-flamines, alios Proto-flamines appellabant.*

That the Ecclesiastical Government of Britain was built upon the Ruins of the Pagan Hierarchy is expressly affirmed by *Ponticus Virginius*. He tells us, That there were in Britain before Christianity 28 Flamens, and three Arch-Flamens. In the room of the Flamens were set up Bishops, and in the room of the Arch-Flamens Arch-Bishops. The Seats of the Arch-Flamens were London, York, and Caerleon upon Usk. To these three Metropolitans were subject 28 Bishops. Fuerunt in Britannia octo & viginti Flamines, nec non tres Archi flamines, quorum potestati cæteri judices morum atque pharatici submittabantur . . . ubi erant Flamines, Bis-

*pos,*

pos, ubi autem Archi-flamines, Archi-  
episcopos posuerunt, mira sanctitate, &  
incredibili devotione. Sedes autem Ar-  
chi-flaminum (quæ fuit antiquissima reli-  
gio) in tribus nobilioribus Civitatibus  
suerant; Lundoniis, viz. atque Eboraci,  
& in Urbe Legionum super Ofcam flu-  
vium — His igitur tribus Metropoli-  
taxis, evanuata superstitione, 28. Episcopi  
subduntur.

P. Virunn.  
Hist. Brit.  
lib. 4 p. 32.

The description that Cæsar gives of  
the Government of the ancient *Druïds*,  
something agrees with this of *Ponticus  
Virunnius*. Cæsar saith concerning the  
*Druïds* of *Francia*, That they managed all  
the Pagan Devotions, under the Con-  
duct of one Chief President, whose Au-  
thority was Supreme; when he died,  
another was chosen to succeed him.  
*Illi rebus divinis intersunt, Sacrificia  
publica ac privata procurant, religiones  
interpretantur* — His quæcum omnibus cæsar de  
Druïdibus præst unus, qui summam in-  
ter eos habet auctoritatem. Hoc mor-  
tuo, si quis ex reliquis excellit dignitate,  
succedit; at si sunt plures pares, suffra-  
gio Druïdum allegitur. He adds, That  
this Discipline was found in *Britain*;  
*Disciplina in Britannia reperta, atque in*

B. II. Gall.  
lib. 6.

*Galliam translatā esse existimatur; & nunc qui diligentius eam rem cognoscere volunt, plerumque illo, discendi causā proficiuntur.*

Having prov'd that Christianity was in the North part of *Britain* before *Palladius's* time, and vindicated *Boethius* and *Fordon*, I proceed to give an Instance of Presbyters Ordaining in *Scotland*.

*Segenius* a Presbyter and Abbot of *Hy*, together with the other Presbyters of the Monastery Ordained Bishop *Aidan*. The Presbyters of *Hy* also Ordain'd *Finan* as Successor to \* *Aidan*.

\*—*Et ipsum esse dignum Episcopatu, ipsum ad erudiendos incredulos & indoctos mitti dibet discernunt, — sive illum ordinantes ad prædicandum miserant— successit vero ei in Episcopatu Finan, & ipse ille ab Hy Scotorum insula, ac Monasterio destinatus. Bede Hist. III. 5. 15.*

To this Quotation 'tis said by some, that *Aidan* was ordain'd by Bishops, which they would thus prove: There was always one Bishop in *Hy* Monastery, as Bishop Usher tells us out of the Ulster Annals; and another person Ordained perhaps only by the Bishop of *Hy*, who was returned back from Northumbria. Then at least there were present two Bishops for *Aidan's* Ordination.

Answ.

1. Answ. 1. We have no Author near that time that saith there was a Bishop constantly resident at *Hy*, which our Adversaries think a good Argument against the Scottish Historians. As to the Annals of *Ulster*, we leave them for Apocryphal, as not being attested by any Author of that Age.

2. But suppose there were a Bishop resident at *Hy*, he was subject to the Abbot, who was the only Church-Governour of the Island, and the Provinces about it. The Monastery was not only exempted from the Government of the Bishops, which is usual, but the Bishops of the Province were subject to the Abbot, and therefore the parallel Instance of *Oxford* being under the Jurisdiction of the Chancellor, and not of the Bishop of the place (which is urged by some) is not to the point, for the Bishop is not subject to the Vice-Chancellor, as the Bishops were to the Abbot of *Hy*. The Bishop of *Oxford* hath a Jurisdiction over all that have a Parochial Cure in the University,

|| *Habere solet ipsa Insula  
victorem semper Abbatem Pres-  
byterum, Cujus Juri & omnis  
Provincia, & ipsi etiam Epis-  
copi, ordine insitato debent  
esse subjecti, juxta Exemplum  
Primi Doctoris illius, qui non  
Episcopus, sed Presbyter exti-  
tit, & Monachus. Bed Hist.  
III. 4.*

## A PLEA for

versity, who swear Canonical Obedience to him, which cannot be said of the Bishops under the Jurisdiction at *Hy*?

3. The second Bishop said to be at *Hy*, when *Aidan* was Ordained, cannot be produced out of *Bede*. It doth not appear that he was Ordained Bishop.

\* Hist. III. \**Bede* calls him only *Sacerdorem*, a Priest.

5. Or if he was, how will it appear that he was Ordain'd by the Bishop of *Hy*?

*Ordain'd perhaps only by the Bishop of Hy*, saith the Learned Historian: Here is a plain begging of the Question; It is taken for granted that this Man was Ordained by the Bishop of *Hy*, which we deny, and which *Bede* no where affirms. *Finan's Ordination* was by the *Seniores* and their *Abbot*, as *Bede* saith, and therefore his Predecessor had no other.

'Tis objected further, That *Finan* must needs be Ordain'd by Bishops, because there were three Bishops at the Ordination of *Cedd*. This deserves to be taken notice of by our Aversaries, and consider'd in other places, where *Bede* speaks of Scottish Ordinations.

I answer we have taken notice of it, and find it doth not at all concern the thing in question. For Cedd's Ordination was at *Lindis-farn* in *England*, out of the Liberties of the Abbots of *Hy*. Let one Example be produced of Ordination by Bishops, within the district of *Hy*, and 'twill be something to the purpose, which I have not yet met with.

Bede speaking of the *British* Bishops, calls them Presbyters or Teachers \* : so that 'tis uncertain what sort of Bishops the old *Brittains* had.

\* *Intertra  
Angliam  
ad iurio  
bis Edil  
berthi Re  
gis Convoca  
tavit ad suum Colloquium Episcopos suis Dilectoris, maxime & proxime  
Britonum Provinciae, &c.*

'Twas many years after Cedd's time, before the *British* Churches would submit to the *Roman* Yoke of Discipline; when they had thoroughly imbib'd the *Romish* Modes and Customs, then at a Synod held at *Celichyth*, A. D. 816. 'twas decreed, *That none of the Scottish Nation should be permitted to use the sacred Ministry among us.*

It's argued further against the *Scotch* Ordinations, that they must needs be Episcopal, because the Romans did not dislike

*dislike the Orders*, that they found in the  
British Church.

*Answe.*

If by the British Church be meant the Church of South Britain, 'tis not to the purpose, as we observed before, but if the Orders conferred in the Monastery of Hy be intended, the Romans were not so ignorant of the Privileges of Abbots, as to dislike their Ordinations, which to this day are allow'd by

\* *Abbas sif Presby-  
ter conferte*.

*poteſt Ordinem Clericalem. Dc̄r. Gr̄c̄.*

XI. The ancient *Waldenses* had their Ministers Ordained by Presbyters without Bishops. They maintain all Ministers to be in a state of parity, and their Presbyters imposed Hands for Ordination.

<sup>†</sup>*Perr. Hist. of Waldens.* lib. I. c. 13. p. 62. *ibid.* cap. 10. p. 53. *vid.* part. 3. l. 2. c. 2. p. 57. These were the Fathers and famous Predecessors of the Protestants, who bore the heat of the day. They had the honour to be first Witnesses against Antichrist, and are to this day, as the Bishop of Salisbury calls them, *The pureſt Remains of primitive Christianity.*

From them the *Fratres Bohemi* had their Succession of Ministers, for they

sent

sent *Michael Zambergius*, and two more, for Ordination to the poor *Waldenses* (who never had a Bishop among them, but in Title only) In compliance with their desires, two of their Titular Bishops, with some Presbyters that had not so much as the Titles of Bishops, made *Zambergius*, and his two Collegues, Bishops, giving them power of Ordination \*. We dislike not, that for Orders sake, the Exercise of this Power should be ordinarily restrained to the graver Ministers, provided they assume it not as proper to themselves by a Divine Right, nor clog it with unscriptural Impositions.

\* Vid. Hist.  
of Bohem.

XII. *Wickliff's* followers here in *England* held and practised Ordination by mere Presbyters, and least any should think they did so of necessity, for want of Bishops, it's to be noted, that they did it upon this Principle, that all Ministers of Christ have equal power \*

\* Lollardi  
sequaces.  
Johannis

*Wickliff*, per idem tempus in errorum suum plurimos seduxerant, tantam presumperunt audaciam, ut eorum Presbyteri more Pontificum, novos crearent Pontifices, afferentes (ut frequenter supra retulimus) quemlibet Sacerdotem tantam consecutum potestatem ligandi atque solvendi & cetera Ecclesiastica Ministrandi, quantum ipse Papa dat vel dare potest. Exercuerunt autem istam perfidiam in *Diocesi Sarum*. Wulf. Hist. Ang. ad A. D. 1389. p. 339.

as the Popish Historian saith, who complains how all parts of *England* were full of those People, and that the Prelates knew of these things, but none were forward to prosecute the Guilty, except the Bishop of *Norwich* \*.

*Audiverunt,*  
*viderunt,*  
*atque scriverunt hec universa pontifices, sed abierunt alii, in villam suam, &c.* This was in King Richard the Second's time.

XIII. In the Island of *Taprobane*, or *Zeilan*, as 'tis now call'd, there was a Church of Christians govern'd by a Presbyter and his Deacon, without any Superior Bishop, to which he or his Flock was subject. This Island is above two thousand Miles in compass \*, a Province big enough for a Bishop, yet had none in *Justin* the Emperour's time, which was about the Year 520,

\* *N. Lloyd Geog. Dict.* <sup>† Legi insignem relationem</sup> *cosme Mo-*  
*nachii Indi-*  
*copœufia de-*  
*Taprobana que*  
*Iesuik, que*  
*nunc Zei-*  
*lan, pli-*

*Seiladiva dicebatur, ubi Justinus Imperatoris etate Ecclesiam Christi-  
 avorum, Presbyter in Perside Ordinatus unde cum suo Diacono regebat,  
 saith L. Holsten. de Minist. Confirm. p. 39.*

By

By this Passage it appears that Bishops were not thought Essential to Churches, no nor in the sixth Age, and that meer Presbyters have power of Jurisdiction, and consequently of Ordination.

The Fathers in the second Council of *Carthage*, A.D. 428. did observe, that until that time, some Dioceses never had any Bishops at all, and thereupon Ordained they should have none for the future \*. They would never have made such a Canon, had they concluded the Government by Bishops to be *Jure Di-* Placuit ut  
Dioceses  
que nun-  
quam Epis-  
copos acce-  
perunt, non  
babeant.  
Con.Carth.  
2.C.5.

C H A P.

## C H A P. XI.

*Objections against Ordinations by Presbyters answered.* 1. That it is against the Canons. So is Episcopal Ordination. 2. It destroys the Line of Succession, answered in Seven Particulars. 3. The Case of Ischyras consider'd. A Passage in Jerom explained.

I Will briefly reflect upon the most material Objections that are made against the Ordination I plead for.

*Object.* 1. Ordination by Presbyters without Bishops is condemned by the Old Canons.

*Answ.* 1. Many things are reserv'd to the Bishops by the Old Canons merely to support their Grandeur. For this reason the Consecration of Churches, the Erecting of Altars, the making of Chrysm, the Reconciling of Penitents, the

Rom. Conc.  
Can. 5.  
Carth. 2.  
Can. 2.

the Vailing of Nuns, &c. were appropriated to the Bishops. All this is ingeniously acknowledged by the Council of *Hispalis* — *Let the Presbyters know that the power of Ordaining Presbyters and Deacons is forbidden them by the Apostolical See, by virtue of novel Ecclesiastical Constitutions* \*. They add, \* *Novillis Ecclesiastis regulis sibi prohibita no-*

*veritate — Presbyterorum Consecratio, &c.*  
*† Us per hoc & discretio gradum, & dignatis fastigiam summis*  
*Pontificis demonstretur. Conc. Hisp. 2. Can. 7.*

For the same reason the *Chorepiscopi*, or Country Bishops, were restrained from Ordaining in the Council of *Antioch* ||.

|| *Quamvis ut Episcopi consecrati*

*sunt, &c. — sic Presbyterum nec Diaconum audent Ordinare pre-*  
*m Civitatis Episcopam. Concil. Antioch. Can. 10. A.D. 344.*

For the same reason 'twas decreed in the Council of *Sardis*, A.D. 347. That no Village or lesser Town must have a Bishop, *ne vilescat nomen Episcopi*.

2. Episcopal Ordinations also, as they are now managed, will prove Nullities by the Old Canons.

Can. 2.

The Ancient Canons, called the Apostles, which are confirmed by the Fifth General Council at ~~Constantinople~~, do depose all Bishops that are chosen by the Civil Magistrate.

Can. 29.

in Conc.

Collect.

Reg. Par.

A.D. 44.

Ex. in. 29.

ep. 29.

Can. 29. If any Bishop obtains a Church by means of the Secular Powers, let him be deposed, and separated from Communion with all his Adherents.

τοῦ πατρὸς ἀπόχει τὸν χειροτονίων, διὰ τοῦ εἰσεγόντος γένεται εὐχαριστία  
τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ αρρενώπολος τοῦ οὐρανού τοῖς αὐτῷ ταῖς.

This Canon is revived by the second  
\* Can. 3. Council of Nice\*, which the Greeks call  
the Seventh General Council.

All our English Bishops are chosen  
by the Magistrate, and not by other  
Bishops, or the Presbyters and People  
of their Diocess. The King's Writ of  
Conge d'Eslier to the Dean and Chapter  
to choose their Bishop, is only matter  
of form; for the King chooseth proper-  
ly, and the Dean and Chapter can-  
not reject the Person whom he recom-  
mends: nor are they the just Repre-  
sentatives of the Clergy and People of  
the Diocess, whose Suffrages were re-  
quired of old in the designation of a Bi-  
shop †.

† Cypr.  
Ep. 68.

Can.

Can. 6. Forbids Bishops to intermed-

dle with Secular Affairs upon pain of Deprivation. *Let no Bishop, Pres-  
byter, or Deacon, assume worldly Cares:*  
and if he doth, let him be deposed. Bi-  
shops at this time were not Judges in Civil Matters, nor Ministers of State, as being a thing inconsistent with their Office, 2 Tim. 2.4.

Can. 80. adds, *A Bishop must not en-  
gage in Publick Administrations, that  
he may give himself to the Work of the  
Ministry; Let him resolutely decline  
these, or be Deposèd; for no Man can  
serve two Masters.*

The Church of England doth not ob-  
serve the Canons of the first General  
Councils, which some || would have us || *Land a-  
gainst Fib-  
er, p. 360.*  
believe are the measures of her Refor-  
mation next the Scripture.

The fourth Canon of the Council of Nic. Concil.  
Nice requires the Ordination of a Bishop Can. 4 →  
to be, by all the Bishops of the Pro- Συνιδει-  
vince, at least by three, with the Con- γεγμα-  
sent of the absent Bishops expressed in των.

I never knew the Content of  
all the Bishops of the Province requi-  
red, much less expressed in Writing, be-

## A PLEA for

## fore the Consecration of English Bishops.

Can. 5. Requires Provincial Councils twice a year. This is not observed.

Can. 6. and 7th, establish the Rights  
and Privileges of Metropolitans.

Quere, Whether Austin the Monk, whom the Pope made Arch-Bishop of Canterbury, did not wrongfully invade the Rights of the Brittish Bishops ( over whom Pope Gregory could give him no just Power, notwithstanding his pretended Grant, mentioned by \* Bede) which are not restored to this day: and if so, whether this doth not make a Canonical Nullity in the whole Succession of English Bishops, who derive their Line from that usurping Prelate.

**¶ Can. 16.** Can. 15 and 16th, ¶ forbids Ministers to remove from the Church in which they were Ordained.

μη μεταβολή; μήτε διόποτεν ————— Ille vero

I might mention several other Canons in this Council, which are not observed, as the third, the eleventh, the fourteenth, (which in the Greek is the eighth)

teenth) the nineteenth and \* twentieth  
which forbids kneeling upon the Lord's  
days. ¶ Can. 20.  
sc̄ntus  
dñe tñ  
dixit ou-  
rōgatis  
dixit amboitac tñ 39.  
as also to receive his to whom he

No more are the Canons of the Great  
Council of Chalcedon observed.

Can. 3. forbids Ministers to take  
Farms or Stewardships, and to inter-  
meddle with Secular Affairs.

Can. 7. † is against the Clergies ¶ Can. 7.  
meddling with Military Affairs, or recei- ¶ 2 mē  
ving Secular Honours upon pain of εν κληρῳ  
Excommunication. Booted Prelates and απλεγ-  
Spiritual Lords would have look'd μῆτρας —  
strange in this Age. μητρὶς εἰς τὸν πόνον διαβάσαι  
εἰς τὸν πόνον διαβάσαι, η τὸν πόνον πέμψαι, καὶ μὴ μεταπλανθίσαι  
εἰδουμενάς.

One of the Methods which Julian  
the Apostate used to corrupt the Clergy  
was to make Senators and Ministers of  
State of them ||. That Politick En- ¶ Alia insu-  
per dolo  
malo indu-  
xit nam &  
in Cleri Or-  
dinum co-  
emy of Christianity knew well enough  
how inconsistent worldly Greatness and  
spiritual Ministers, & Ministers perverted fungi fassit. Niciphe  
Eccl. Hist. XIII.

\* Dominion would be with that humble Mortification, and vigorous Application which the Gospel requires. He that had been a \* READER in the Church before he came to the Empire, could not be ignorant of that Precept of our Saviour to his Apostles, *MATTHEW. 26. 25,* 26. *The Princes of this world exercise Dominion over them, but it shall not be so among you.*

Can. 10. Depose all Obstinate Pluralists.

This Cation, if executed, would bear hard upon our Gigantick Pluralists, that heap Pelion upon Ossa, Steeple upon Steeple, as if they would mount to Heaven from the Pinnacle of Ecclesiastical Promotions.

I only produce these Canons ad hominem, to shew how unreasonable 'tis to urge old Canons against Ordinations by Presbyters, when they may be equally urged against Episcopal Ordinations.

We judge it more ingenuous to disown their Authority over us, as being made by such as had no power to give

Uni-

Universal Laws to the Church, then pretend Submission to them, as they do, who act in open Contradiction to them. If then it be a Crime not to observe the Canons, let them that are without Canonical Gait cast the first Stone.

**Object. 2.** Your Ordinations are not by such *Diocesans* as have uninterrupted Succession down from the Apostles.

**Answe. 1.** This is the triumphing Argument of the Papists against the first Reformers. They peremptorily deny the validity of their Ordinations, because they wanted this Succession. It is urged by *Bellarmino*, *De Sacram.*

*Ordinis. cap. 2.* and by *Gretzer* against *Luther*, *Ep. Dedic. pref. Operibus e-*  
*ius.*

The same Argument is used by *Par-*  
*sions*, the supposed Author of the *Three*  
*Concessions of England*, part 2. cap. 10.  
and by *Stapleton*, *Rel. cap. 1. q. 4. art. 2.*  
as also by *Armonx* the Jesuit in *Moulin's*  
*Buckler*, p. 274, 275. *Tarrian* the Je-  
suate writ a great Book *de Ordinationi-*  
*bis Ministrorum Ecclesie*, against the  
*Ordinations* in Protestant Churches.  
The Sum of all his Arguments is this

*Sed. Oper.*  
p. 594.

of the Succession, which we find gathered up in this Syllogism by M. Sadeel, All Lawful Ordinations depend upon an Ordinary Succession of Bishops, under the Roman Pontiff, the visible Head of the whole Church; but no Protestant Ordinations are such; therefore no Protestant Ordinations are lawful, but they are void, null, and merely *Laic*. This Argument is exactly the same that is used against our Ordinations; but with this Addition, That the Pope is put at the top-of the Line of Succession, which adds no great Reputation to it.

2. This Argument of the Succession is at large refuted by our Protestant Writers. *Sadeel* calls it, *principium adversariorum Argumentum*; he challenges them to produce some Scripture to confirm it by. Several Testimonies of the Ancients are cited by him, that the Succession they plead for is a Succession of *Doctrine*, and not of *Persons*; which Succession of Doctrine failing in the Romish Church, the other Succession of Persons is a mere useless Carcass. These offensive Carcasses of Popish Bishops are animated by some to propagate a Generation of immortal Successors.

He

He further proves, that the Ordinary Succession of Ministers may be interrupted by Scripture Examples; as P. 551, 552  
when the Priesthood was taken away from the Hoyle of Ely, to whom a Promise of perpetual Succession was made, v. Sam. 2. 30. And under the Kings of Israel, God raised up Elijah to preach Repentance to them, though he was not ex Sacerdotum Ordine. Nay, Christ himself coming to reform his Church, chose unto himself Apostles, not from the Priests, but from other Families. He did not observe the Ordinary Succession in the Reformation of the Church.

To which I may add, That the Roman Governors set up and deposed what High Priests they pleased in the Jewish Church, without regard to Lineal Succession. \* *Josephus* gives many Instances of this kind; *Vide lib. 15. c. 2.* XV. 3, 6, 7, 8. If ever an uninterrupted Succession were necessary to the being of a Church, it must be in the Jewish Priesthood, which was entailed upon one Family; but the Church remained a true Church, though the regular Succession was destroyed.

To

of the Succession, which we find gathered up in this Syllogism by M. Sadeel, All  
 Sad. Oper. lawful Ordinations depend upon an Ordinary Succession of Bishops, under the Ro-  
 p. 594 man Pontiff, the visible Head of the whole Church; but no Protestant Ordina-  
 tions are such; therefore no Protestant Ordinations are lawful, but they are void, null, and meerly *Laic*. This Argument is exactly the same that is used against our Ordinations; but with this Addition, That the Pope is put at the top of the Line of Succession, which adds no great Reputation to it.

2. This Argument of the Succession is at large refuted by our Protestant Writers. Sad. de le git. vocat. Sadeel calls it, *principium adversariorum Argumentum*; he challenges Ministr. p. 545— them to produce some Scripture to confirm it by. Several Testimonies of the Ancients are cited by him, that the Succession they plead for is a Succession of Doctrine, and not of Persons; which Succession of Doctrine failing in the Romish Church, the other Succession of Persons is a meer useleſs Carcass. These offensive Carcasses of Popish Bishops are animated by some to propagate a Generation of immortal Successors.

He

He further proves, that the Ordinary Succession of Ministers may be interrupted by Scripture Examples; as P. 351, 352 when the Priesthood was taken away from the Hoyle of Ely, to whom a Promise of perpetual Succession was made, v. Sam. 2. 30. And under the Kings of Israel, God raised up Elijah to preach Repentance to them, though he was not ex Sacerdotum Ordine. Nay, Christ himself coming to reform his Church, chose unto himself Apostles, not from the Priests, but from other Families. He did not observe the Ordinary Succession in the Reformation of the Church.

To which I may add, That the Roman Governours set up and deposed what High Priests they pleased in the Jewish Church, without regard to Lineal Succession. \* *Josephus* gives many <sup>\* Antiq.</sup> Instances of this kind; *Vide lib. 15. c. 2.* XV. 3, 6, 7, 8. If ever an uninterrupted Succession were necessary to the being of a Church, it must be in the Jewish Priesthood, which was entailed upon one Family; but the Church remained a true Church, though the regular Succession was destroyed.

To

To the same effect speaks holy Mr. Bradford, the Martyr, to Dr. Marpissfield; First Act You shall not find, faith he, in all the and Mon. A.D. 1555. *Scripture, this your essential part of Succession of Bishops.* In Christ's church Antichrist will succeed to the朝

Folk on Ep. Sect. 4. Dr. Falk faith, If the Truth of Do-  
ctrine be necessary to prove a true Church,  
the Scriptures are sufficient to prove a  
true Church with lawful Succession also.

Dr. Field is of the same Judgment  
in this Point. *Field of the Church,* II.  
6. & III. 39. edit. most. 1610.

Mr. Perkins distinguisheth of a three-  
fold Succession. The first of Persons  
and Doctrines, in the primitive Church.  
The second of Persons alone, among Infi-  
dels and Heretics. The third of Do-  
ctrine alone. And thus our Ministers,  
faith he, succeed the Apostles; and this  
is sufficient. For this Rule may be re-  
membered, that the power of the Keys,  
that of Order and Jurisdiction, is given  
by God, and annex'd in the New Testament  
to Doctrine.

<sup>Park Vol. 3 p. 171—</sup> Dr. White largely confutes this pre-  
tended Succession in his defence of the

<sup>P. 554, 557</sup> Orthod. Faith, p. 120—155. way to the true Church. So doth his  
Brother Mr. Francis White ||.

Thus

¶ Thus we see the vanity of this pretended Succession, who they be that maintain it, and who are the Opposers of it. ¶ It's one of the Pillars of the Popish Church, which supports that torturing Fabrick, amidst all their two main

¶ The Arguments against our Ordination must needs be very defective, when no other can be found, but those which the Jesuits urge against all Protestant Ordinations. ¶ It's an ill Cause that must be defended by Weapons borrowed out of their Tents. ¶ Is there no Sword in Israel that you go to the Philistines to sharpen your Goads?

¶ 3. The violent Assertors and Defendants of this Opinion, little consider that by this Hypothesis there can be no true Ministers in the Church of England; for it's certain the Chain of Succession pleaded for, hath been broken again and again. One Nullity makes a breach in the whole Chain. All our Bishops, as such, derive their Succession from Rome. Now if we can find any Interruption in the Succession of Bishops thereby it Nullifies all the Administrations of those that depend upon them. If the Pope succeeds Peter, as Darknes doth

doth Light ; if he who calls himself *Christ's Vicar*, proves to be the *Anti-christ* ; if many Popes were *Heretics*, *Sodomites*, *Idolaters*, *Conjurers*, *Whoremongers*, *Murderers*, &c. as some of their own Authors affirm ; if there were two or three Popes at a time, and if they were rather *Apostatical* than *Apostolical* for fifty years together, as their own *Baronius* confesseth, what becomes of the pretended Line of Succession ? If none of these things can infringe it, what can ? We may as rationally affirm that a Dog may generate a Man, as that the *Man of God* may be the *Off-spring of the Man of Sin*. I doubt not but Christ had his Ministers in the darkest Ages of the Church, but not by virtue of this Succession in debate.

4. Nay, this Principle destroys all Churches in the World. For there's no Church this day can produce such a Testimonial of Succession, as hath met with no Canonical Interruption. They that bid fairest for it, are the *Greek* Churches, the *Latine*, and the *African* Churches ; and all of them derive the Succession from the same Source, making *Peter* the Head of it. The *Greeks*

pro-

produce a large Catalogue of Patriarchs proceeding from *Peter*, until the time of *Neophytus*, who not many years ago held the See at *Constantinople*. The Christians of *Africa*, especially the *Habasses*, who are the most considerable among them, derive their Succession from the *Patriarch of Alexandria*, and he from *Mark* and *Peter*. The Western Churches also derive the Succession from the same Spring. Thus we have the most considerable Sects of Christians in the World, deriving their Claim from one and the same Apostle. All would be reputed the Off-spring of the Chief Apostle, and glory in their Relation to him. It seems *Paul*, the Great Apostle of the Gentiles, who laboured more abundantly than all the rest, either left no Successor behind him, or no Body knows what is become of him? *Sic vos non vobis*, &c.

*Peter* the Apostle of the Circumcision, must be the Universal Head of all the Gentile-Churches; and *Paul*, with the rest of the Apostles, must be written Childeless, or be the Progenitors of such an Off-spring that is long ago extinct, or so very obscure, that their Names are written in the Dust.

But

## A P E E A f o r

Bat how comes Peter to Canton his  
Bishoptick into three Parts, and to  
leave three Successors behind him?  
By the same Rule, every Bishop must  
have more Successors then one, three  
at least, and each of them as many  
and so forward until Bishopticks be  
crumbled into Parochial Churches;  
and the Patrimony of Peter, by an  
*Apostolical Gavel-kind*, be equally di-  
vided between his Parochial Suc-  
cessors.

But the unhappiness of it is, the  
three Patriarchal Successors cannot a-  
gree about the divided Inheritance.  
The eldest Brother (for so the Pope  
of Rome reckons himself) Condemns the  
two others as spurious, and Claims to  
himself the Universal Inheritance. His

\* De Not. Advocate \* Bellarmine exprefly affirms,  
Eccl. cap. 8.

*Nos posse ostendi in Ecclesia Graeca Suc-  
cessionem.* He adds, We see that the o-  
ther Apostolick Sees are decay'd and  
fall'd; viz. those of Antioch, Alexan-  
dria, and Jerusallem, wherein after that  
those places were taken away from the  
Romans by the Persians and Saracens  
(since which time there are nine hundred  
years past) there hath been no Successi-

reputation if there were any, he said  
was very obscure.

Stapleton also saith  
of the Greek Church, That she hath  
no Legitimate Succession. <sup>\* Stapl.  
Doctr.  
Princip.  
1.13 c.6.</sup>

The Greek Churches on the other  
hand condemn the Roman Succession.

Primi qui scripsit primariam Romanum Pater  
afficit oppugnatur et didicuntur falsi Graeci,  
saith Bellarmine. And now equalled by

Bellarium, the Monk, thus attacks the  
Roman Succession. What Latin saith he,  
obligeth us to reckon the Bishop of Rome  
Peter's only Successor, that must rule all  
the rest : and why not the Bishop  
of Alexandria be accounted Peter's Suc-  
cessor, and so challenge the Supremacy ?  
For as Clemens was made Bishop of Roma,  
so was Mark the Evangelist Bishop of  
Alexandria. <sup>Quemam  
Lxx solum  
jubet inter  
ceteros Ro-  
manum E-  
piscopum  
bius Suc-  
cessorum  
appellari. . .  
De Prin-  
cip. Cap. 3.  
in Bibl. Pa-  
tr.</sup>

He strikes at the Head of the Suc-  
cession, and denies Peter to have been  
Bishop of Roma <sup>† Bar. lb.  
Func.  
Com. in  
Chron. ad  
An. 44</sup>, as many of our Pro-  
testant Writers have done. If there-  
fore a Man would know the true  
Church by Pastoral Succession, 'tis dif-  
ficult to know what part to take, espe-  
cially considering that of all the pre-  
tended Successions, the Roman ( from  
which the English Prelacy derives it  
self )

self) is most suspicious, as being often interrupted by *Simony*, *Heresie*, and *Schism*. Pope *Eugenius* the Fourth was deposed by the General Council of *Basil*, and pronounced Heretick and Schismatick, with all his Adherents; yet he retains the Papal Authority against the Judgment of that Council; Cardinals and Bishops were Instituted by him.

5. By this Principle no Man can know himself to be a Minister of Christ. Can any Man know that all the Predecessors of that Bishop that Ordained him were Canonical Bishops? that none of them came in by Simony, or err'd in the Fundamentals, so as to be guilty of Heresie? that none of them lost their Authority by involving themselves in Secular and Publick Administrations?

\* Can. Ap. 8o. strations \*, or by neglecting to instruct their Flocks †, or by being Ordained

† Can. 57. by a Bishop without the reach of his

|| Can. 36. own Jurisdiction || ? These things make Conſt. 1. Canonical Nullities. Can any Man

Can. 3. know, who was the Bishop that was the Root of his Succession? A great part of the Christian World is uncertain what Apostles did first Convert their particular Countries, which were it known, would

would not yet resolve the Point. Conscience will not be satisfied, with saying, *Let others disprove my Succession.* It must have positive Grounds of Satisfaction, that I am a true Minister of Christ. So that this Notion serves only to perplex Ministers and People, with insuperable difficulties about their acceptance with God, and to leave Christianity it self upon such precarious Foundations, as will be, in the power of every Critick in Church-History to shake, if not to overturn.

How is it possible, That plain illiterate People should know this Succession, which is learnt only by reading of the *Greek* and *Latine* Fathers, the length and obscurity of which wearieth the wisest Men, and which oftentimes contradict themselves. Ought not the Consciences of the meanest to be satisfied in the Call of their Ministers? Must they act in a Matter of so great importance by an Implicit Faith? What Rule shall they judge by? not by the Line of Succession; that will but lead them into an

N in-

inextricable Labyrinth. Our Saviour hath left us a better Rule, *By their Fruits ye shall know them.*

6. Let it be further considered, That the Catalogues that are brought by some of the Ancients, of the Successors of the Apostles, were made by Conjecture \*. Nor is this Succession so evident and convincing in all places, as it ought to be, to demonstrate the thing intended. A List would be expected of Apostolical Successors; not only in the Great Patriarchal Churches, but in all others planted by the Apostles, as *Philippi*, *Corinth*, *Cæsarea*, and in all the Seven Churches of *Asia*, (and not only at *Ephesus*) which has not been yet produced. Though in the Patriarchal Churches the beginning of the Line is as obscure as the Head of *Nilus*. At *Rome*, 'tis not certain whether *Linus*, *Cletus*, *Anacletus*, or *Clemens* are to be reckon'd first. And as for *Antioch*, 'tis far from being agreed, wheter *Peter*, *Enodius*, or *Ignatius* succeeded *Peter* or *Paul*, or the one and the other *Paul*.

\* *Euseb. Ec.  
Hist. l. 3. c. 4.*

*Vide Dr.  
Still. Iren.*

*Paul.* At Alexandria ; where the Succession seems to run clearest , the Original of the Power is imputed to the Choice of Presbyters , and to no Divine Institution, as we observed already.

7. If there were any certainty in this Succession , the Fathers ascribe it to Presbyters , as much as to Bishops . \* *Ignatius* saith concerning them , *τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ εἰς τόπον σωματεῖς τῷ Ἀποστόλῳ* — That the Presbyters succeeded in the place of the Bench of the Apostles .

*Irenæus* affirms the same — *Cum autem ad eam iterum Traditionem, quæ est ab Apostolis, quæ per Successiōnem Presbyteriorum in Ecclesiis custoditur, provocamus eos qui adversantur Traditioni; dicent se non solum Presbyteris, sed etiam Apostolis existentes sapientiores, &c.* Though the truth is, when the Fathers insist upon the Succession of Bishops or Presbyters , they are not to be understood of the Succession of Persons, but principally of the Succession of Doctrine, which the

\* *Ad Magn. p. 33. Voss. Edit.*

*Advers. hær. l. 3. c. 2*

first Bishops or Pastors of Churches kept inviolable, as received from the Apostles. Otherwise, the Succession of Persons without the Orthodox Doctrine, is no note of a true Church, as among the *Arians*, where they had a Succession of Bishops, and yet no true Church.

*Nazianz. in laud. Athan.*

*Pietatis successio proprie successio aestimanda est, namque qui eandem fidei Doctrinam ejusdem quoque Throni particeps est; qui autem Contrariam fidem amplectitur, adversarius in Throno etiam Censeri debet: Atque haec quidem nomen, illa vero rem ipsam & veritatem habet successionis.*

Now the Succession of true Doctrine being wanting in the Popish Church, the other of Persons is an empty Name to circumvent the Simple.

*Objet. 3. Ischyras was Deposited because he was Ordained by Colluthus a Presbyter of Alexandria. Thus Bishop Hall in his Divine Right of Episcopacy, p. 91, 92. and Bilson's Perpetual Government, cap. 13.*

*Answ.*

*Answ.* *Colluthus* Ordained as a pretended Bishop, constituted by *Meletius* Arch Bishop of *Thebas*, and therefore was commanded by the *Alexandrian* Council to be a Presbyter, as he had been formerly. *Ischyras's* Ordination was declared void, as being not acknowledged by them that were reported to be the Authors; himself also is reckon'd by *Austin* amongst the Hereticks, and his Ordination was a notorious breach of the Canons; it was *sine titulo, extra fines, and nulli vicinorum nota*; all which Circumstances make it uncanonical.

*Dr. Field* saith, *That when Presbyters Ordinations were accounted void,* <sup>Dr. Field. de Eccles. III. 39.</sup> *it's to be understood according to the rigour of Canons in use in their Age;* which appears (saith he) by this, that *Ordinations, sine Titulo, were null.* Conc. Chalc. Can. 6.

*The Reverend Author of the Naked Truth* thus answers Bishop *Hall's* Objection about *Colluthus* and *Ischyras*.

*I am sorry, saith he, so good a Man had no better proof for his intended purpose.*

*pose.* It seems he quite forgot how that the famous Council of Nice made a Canon, wherein they declare that if any Bishop should Ordain any of the Clergy belonging to another Bishops Diocese without his consent, their Ordination should be null. You see then the irregular Ordination of a Bishop, is as null as the irregular Ordination of a Presbyter: therefore the irregular Bishop, and the irregular Presbyter, are of the same Order, of the same Authority, neither able to Ordain.

*Object. 4.* It is objected out of Jerom, *Quid facit Episcopus, quod non facit Presbyter, excepta Ordinatione?*

*Answ.* Jerom speaks of Canonical Restraints, and not of Scriptural: for the design of his Discourse is to prove the identity of Bishops and Presbyters, and having brought many Arguments from Scripture to prove it, he confirms it, by asking this Question, *What doth a Bishop more than a Presbyter, except Ordination?* plainly intimating that this could not advance him to a superior

Or-

Order, the Bishop and Presbyter being originally the same. As if he would say, The Presbyters perform the most transcendent Acts of Religion, they are Ambassadors for Christ, to preach the Gospel, they administer Baptism and the Lord's Supper; and what doth a Bishop more than these, except Ordination; which being no Sacrament, is inferior in dignity to the other mentioned Acts, and therefore cannot elevate them to a higher degree. A Canonical Restraint cannot prejudice their inherent Power.

**F I N I S.**

*Books Printed for John Salusbury  
at the Rising Sun in Cornhil.*

**P**RACTICAL Reflections on the late Earthquakes in *Jamaica, England, Sicily, Malta, Anno 1692.* with a particular Historical Account of those, and divers other Earthquakes, by *John Shower.*

**E**arthquakes explained and Practical-ly improved, occasioned by the late Earthquakes on Sept. 18. 1692. in *London* and many other Parts in *England* and beyond *Sea,* by *Theo. Doolittle M.A.* The Duty and Blessing of a Tender Conscience plainly stated, and earnestly recommended to all that regard Acceptance with God, and the Prosperity of their Souls, by *T. Cruſo.*

The Christian Laver; or a Discourse opening the Nature of Participation with, and demonstrating the Necessity of Purification by Christ, by *T. Cruſo.*

Four Sermons on several Occasions, by *T. Cruſo.*

Barbarian Cruelty; being a true History of the distressed Condition of the Christian Captives under the Tyrany of *Mull, Ishmael Emperor of Morocco, &c.* by *Francis Brooks.*

The Mirrour of Divine Love unvail'd in a Paraphrase on the *Song of Solomon,* by *Robert Fleming V. D. M.*

would not yet resolve the Point. Conscience will not be satisfied, with saying, *Let others disprove my Succession.* It must have positive Grounds of Satisfaction, that I am a true Minister of Christ. So that this Notion serves only to perplex Ministers and People, with insuperable difficulties about their acceptance with God, and to leave Christianity it self upon such precarious Foundations, as will be, in the power of every Critick in Church-History to shake, if not to overturn.

How is it possible, That plain illiterate People should know this Succession, which is learnt only by reading of the Greek and Latine Fathers, the length and obscurity of which wearieth the wisest Men, and which oftentimes contradict themselves. Ought not the Consciences of the meanest to be satisfied in the Call of their Ministers? Must they act in a Matter of so great importance by an Implicit Faith? What Rule shall they judge by? not by the Line of Succession; that will but lead them into an

N in-

A PLEA for  
inextricable Labyrinth. Our Saviour  
hath left us a better Rule, *By their  
Fruits ye shall know them.*

6. Let it be further considered, That the Catalogues that are brought by some of the Ancients, of the Successors of the Apostles, were made by Conjecture\*. Nor is this Succession so evident and convincing in all places, as it ought to be, to demonstrate the thing intended. A List would be expected of Apostolical Successors, not only in the Great Patriarchal Churches, but in all others planted by the Apostles, as *Philippi*, *Corinth*, *Cæsarea*, and in all the Seven Churches of *Asia*, (and not only at *Ephesus*) which has not been yet produced. Though in the Patriarchal Churches the beginning of the Line is as obscure as the Head of *Nilus*. At *Rome*, 'tis not certain whether *Linus*, *Cletus*, *Anacletus*, or *Clemens* are to be reckon'd first. And as for *Antioch*, 'tis far from being agreed, wheter *Peter*, *Euodius*, or *Ignatius* succeeded *Peter* or *Paul*, or the one and the other *Paul*.

\* Euseb. Ec.  
Hist. l. 3. c. 4

Vide Dr.  
Still. Iren.

*Paul.* At *Alexandria*, where the Succession seems to run clearest, the Original of the Power is imputed to the Choice of Presbyters, and to no Divine Institution, as we observed already.

7. If there were any certainty in this Succession, the Fathers ascribe it to Presbyters, as much as to Bishops. \* *Ignatius* saith concerning them, <sup>\*Ad Magn. p. 33. Voit. Edit.</sup> τῷ περιστέπων εἰς τόπον σωματίς τῷ Αποστόλῳ — That the Presbyters succeeded in the place of the Bench of the Apostles.

*Irenaeus* affirms the same — Cum autem ad eam iterum Traditionem, quae est ab *Apostolis*, quae per Successiōnem Presbyteriorum in Ecclesiis custoditur, provocamus eos qui adversantur Traditioni; dicent se non solum Presbyteris, sed etiam *Apostolis* existentes sapientiores, &c. Though the truth is, when the Fathers insist upon the Succession of Bishops or Presbyters, they are not to be understood of the Succession of Persons, but principally of the Succession of Doctrine, which the

first Bishops or Pastors of Churches kept inviolable, as received from the Apostles. Otherwise, the Succession of Persons without the Orthodox Doctrine, is no note of a true Church, as among the *Arians*, where they had a Succession of Bishops, and yet

*Nazianz. in laud. A- than.* *Pietatis successio proprie successio aestimanda est, namque qui eandem fideli Doctrinam ejusdem quoque Throni particeps est; qui autem Contrariam fidem amplectitur, adver- Jarius in Throno etiam Censerri debet: Atque haec quidem nomen, illa vero rem ipsam & veritatem habet successionis.* Now the Succession of true Doctrine being wanting in the Popish Church, the other of Persons is an empty Name to circumvent the Simple.

*Object. 3. Ischyras was Deposited because he was Ordained by Colluthus a Presbyter of Alexandria. Thus Bishop Hall in his Divine Right of Episcopacy, p. 91, 92. and Bilson's Perpetual Government, cap. 13.*

*Answ.*

*Answ.* *Colluthus* Ordained as a pretended Bishop, constituted by *Meletius* Arch Bishop of *Thebais*, and therefore was commanded by the *Alexandrian* Council to be a Presbyter, as he had been formerly. *Ischyras's* Ordination was declared void, as being not acknowledged by them that were reported to be the Authors; himself also is reckon'd by *Austin* amongst the Hereticks, and his Ordination was a notorious breach of the Canons; it was *sine titulo, extra fines, and nulli vicinorum nota*; all which Circumstances make it uncanonical.

Dr. *Field* saith, *That when Presbyters Ordinations were accounted void, it's to be understood according to the rigour of Canons in use in their Age; which appears (saith he) by this, that Ordinations, sine Titulo, were null.* Conc. Chalc. Can. 6. bis 290

The Reverend Author of the *Naked Truth* thus Answers Bishop *Hall's* Objection about *Colluthus* and *Ischyras*.

*I am sorry, saith he, so good a Man had no better proof for his intended purpose.*

ches  
the  
ssion  
Do-  
rch,  
they  
d yet  
o pro-  
e qui  
quo-  
utem  
dver-  
ebet:  
rem  
ffusion.  
trine  
urch,  
Name  
  
ed be-  
hus a  
s Bi-  
of E-  
Per-  
  
Answ.

*Athanas.*  
*Apol. 2.*

*Dr. Field.*  
*de Eccles.*  
*III. 39.*

*Naked*  
*Truth, p. 45*

pose. It seems he quite forgot how that the famous Council of Nice made a Canon, wherein they declare that if any Bishop shoud Ordain any of the Clergy belonging to another Bishops Dioceſſ without his consent, their Ordination should be null. You see then the irregular Ordination of a Bishop, is as null as the irregular Ordination of a Presbyter: therefore the irregular Bishop, and the irregular Presbyter, are of the same Order, of the same Authority, neither able to Ordain.

Object. 4. It is objected out of Jerom, *Quid facit Episcopus, quod non facit Presbyter, excepta Ordinatione?*

Anſw. Jerom speaks of Canonical Restraints, and not of Scriptural: for the design of his Discourse is to prove the identity of Bishops and Presbyters, and having brought many Arguments from Scripture to prove it, he confirms it, by asking this Question, *What doth a Bishop more then a Presbyter, except Ordination?* plainly intimating that this could not advance him to a superior

Or-

Order, the Bishop and Presbyter being originally the same. As if he would say, The Presbyters perform the most transcendent Acts of Religion, they are Ambassadors for Christ, to preach the Gospel, they administer Baptism and the Lord's Supper; and what doth a Bishop more than these, except Ordination? which being no Sacrament, is inferiour in dignity to the other mentioned Acts, and therefore cannot elevate them to a higher degree. A Canonical Restraint cannot prejudice their inherent Power.

F I N I S.

*Books Printed for John Salisbury  
at the Rising Sun in Cornhill.*

**P**RACTICAL Reflections on the late Earth-  
quakes in *Jamaica, England, Sicily,  
Malta, Anno 1692.* with a particular  
Historical Account of those, and divers  
other Earthquakes, by *John Shower.*

Earthquakes explained and Practically improved, occasioned by the late Earthquakes on Sept. 18. 1692. in *London,* and many other Parts in *England* and beyond *Sea,* by *Tho. Doolittle M.A.*

**T**he Duty and Blessing of a Tender Conscience plainly stated, and earnestly recommended to all that regard Acceptance with God, and the Prosperity of their Souls, by *T. Cruſo.*

**T**he Christian Laver; or a Discourse opening the Nature of Participation with, and demonstrating the Necessity of Purification by Christ, by *T. Cruſo.*

Four Sermons on several Occasions, by *T. Cruſo.*

**B**arbarian Cruelty; being a true History of the distressed Condition of the Christian Captives under the Tyrany of *Mully Ishmael Emperor of Morocco, &c.* by *Francis Brooks.*

**T**he Mirrour of Divine Love unvail'd in a Paraphrase on the *Song of Solomon,* by *Robert Flemming V. D. M.*

THE  
C A S E  
O F

Moralities and Non-Residence

Rightly Stated.

A